

**NWX-DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR-NBC**

**Moderator: Jennifer Romero**  
**November 7, 2015**  
**1:00 pm CT\***

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in listen-only mode until the comments section of today's conference. At that time, to provide a comment, please press Star 1 on your phone and record your name at the prompt.

This call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the call over to Miss (Kris Sarri). Thank you. Ma'am, you may begin.

Kris Sarri: Thank you very much. Aloha and good morning from Washington DC. Welcome to the public teleconference on the proposed rule entitled Procedures for Reestablishing a Formal Government to Government Relationship with the Native Hawaiian Community.

I'm (Kris Sarri), Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Management and Budget here at the Department of Interior. And I want to thank you for joining us.

*\*Caller names were transcribed phonetically. We regret any spelling inaccuracies.*

I'd like to introduce the Department of Interior officials sitting in Washington DC. We have Jody Cummings, Deputy Solicitor; and Jennifer Romero, Senior Advisor to the Secretary.

Before we open up the phone lines for comments, Jody Cummings will provide us a standard overview of the proposed rule. Jody.

Jody Cummings: Thank you (Kris). Good morning everyone. Let me start by saying I'm not going to be able to cover everything that's in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, but I will give a brief overview of the proposal to give folks some context for our call today.

I want to encourage everyone to read that document for themselves. It's available on the Department of Interior's website if you search for Office of Native Hawaiian Relation. It's also available at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) by searching for the term Native Hawaiian or you can find it by docket number. And that's DOI20150005. Let me give you that docket number one more time. DOI-2015-0005.

Let me start with some background. The native Hawaiian community has one of the largest indigenous populations in the United States. But unlike more than 500 federally recognized native communities on the continent, native Hawaiians lack both an organized government and a formal government-to-government relationship with the United States.

In response to requests for the native Hawaiian community, the Department of Interior published an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking in June 2014. That document solicited public comment regarding whether the Department of Interior should assist with, first, reorganization of a native Hawaiian

government and, second, reestablishment of a formal government-to-government relationship with the native Hawaiian community.

The Department conducted a total of 15 public hearings in Hawaii and five mainland regional tribal consultations in Indian country resulting in over 40 hours of oral testimony on the advance notice. By the end of the comment period in August 2014 we had received over 5,000 written comments for the record. We greatly appreciate the public interest and the input we received during those consultations and in written comment.

Following review of the oral and written comment, the Department determined that it would not propose a rule that attempted to involve the Department with organization of a native Hawaiian government or form or structure of that government. The native Hawaiian community itself should determine whether -- and how -- to reorganize a government.

The Department has accordingly proposed a more limited rule creating a process that the Secretary of the Interior would use to determine whether to reestablish a formal government-to-government relationship if the native Hawaiian community forms a government that then seeks such a relationship with the United States.

Our proposed rule explains that a formal government-to-government relationship would allow the United States to more effectively implement and administer the special political and trust relationship that Congress has already established with the native Hawaiian community by enacting more than 150 federal statutes over the last century.

Now, I want to briefly address the scope of the proposed rule which involves a multi-step process. First, the native Hawaiian community would draft a

constitution or other governing document. The community would then vote on the constitution in a ratification referendum. If the constitution is approved, the community would elect leaders of the new government. Then the new government could -- if it decided to do so -- submit to the Secretary of the Interior a request to reestablish a government-to-government relationship.

Applying specific criteria set forth in the proposed rule, the Secretary would decide whether to grant or deny the request. The native Hawaiian community's government-to-government relationship with the United States would then be the same under the US Constitution and Federal law as that of any federally recognized tribe in the continental United States and the native Hawaiian government would be recognized as having the same inherent sovereign governmental authority subject to Congress's plenary power.

I went to emphasize that the native Hawaiian community would make all of the key decisions in this process. The community would draft a governing document, ratify that document, elect leaders, and decide whether to seek a formal relationship with the United States. The federal government's role would be limited to receiving a request from the new government and deciding whether the request meets the criteria of the proposed rule.

An important thing we heard in previous public comments is that those native Hawaiians who are eligible for benefit under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act were concerned about protection of their rights. The proposed rule contains language explaining that it does not affect the rights of beneficiaries. The rule also provides that the ratification vote would have to be supported by a majority of the HHCA beneficiaries who vote, as well as a majority of native Hawaiians generally.

Again, this is just a short overview of the proposal. I encourage everyone to read the proposal for themselves and comment today during this call or in writing. Thanks very much. (Kris)

Kris Sarri: Thanks Jody. Now I'll provide some brief guidelines for the call. Today's call is scheduled for three hours. The call will be recorded and transcribed for the record. A written transcription of this call will be available for review on our Office of Native Hawaiian Relations Web site at [www.doi.gov/ohr](http://www.doi.gov/ohr). It should be available within a few days.

Please check the Web site regularly for updates. In order to maximize the use of our time allotted today and to hear from as many commenters as possible, we'll limit each speaker to three minutes. Before you begin your testimony, please say and spell your name and let us know if you are testifying on behalf of yourself or for an organization or group.

Because we have many participants today, we will have to enforce the three-minute time limit strictly. We will move onto the next caller promptly at the three-minute mark. We understand that three minutes is not a lot of time. We urge you to be specific, explain the reasoning behind your comments, and address the proposed rule.

We are very interested in hearing your thoughts on the procedure and criteria that is set out in the proposed rule for reestablishing a formal government-to-government relationship between the United States and the native Hawaiian community.

If there is time remaining after all speakers have commented, we will open up the call for a second round of comments. Please know that written comments on the proposed rule may be submitted any time until December 30, 2015.

Instructions for submitting written comments can be found on Page 59114 -- let me repeat that -- 59114 of the Federal Register Notice that announce the proposed rule. And that may be found at [www.federalregister.gov](http://www.federalregister.gov) or the Web site for the Office of Native Hawaiian Relations.

If you are unable to provide comments on this call, if your comments were cut short, or if you simply prefer to submit additional thoughts, we encourage you to submit comments in writing.

The call is facilitated by an operator, (Jenny), who will manage the time and patch speakers through to the panel when it is their time to speak. All callers are able to listen. Callers do not have to testify for the record, you may just listen in. Please be thoughtful of others and respect the time limit. We would like to hear from everyone who chooses to speak in the time we have set aside today.

Unfortunately, we are unable to provide translation services, so if you'd like to testify in your native language, please provide a translation for us during your allotted speaking time so that we can understand the meaning of your comment.

Finally, I'll provide some guidance on our process. For many federal proposed rules, the only way to comment is to submit a comment in writing. But for this proposed rule, we are hosting teleconferences such as this one to accommodate speakers who would like to make oral comments for the record. As I mentioned earlier, these comments will be transcribed and made available for review on our Web site. Comments made on these teleconferences will be treated exactly the same as written comments.

The Department will collect all comments, categorize them and then summarize them in order to undertake its analysis. If a final rule is issued, we will provide responses to the comments in writing on the federal register. This is the standard process for federal rule making by any federal agency. That is why today the federal panel is in listening mode only. We will not respond to any substantive comments or questions today since the focus of this call is to hear testimony on the proposed rule.

We tried to anticipate frequently asked questions related to the proposed rule in an FAQ document available on our Office of Native Hawaiian Relations Web site. The text of the proposed rule also contains answers to questions we received during the advance notice of proposed rulemaking phase of the rulemaking

Today's meeting is an opportunity for you to make official public comments on the proposed rule without having to put pen to paper and without having to type out an email. But we do appreciate your written comments and we encourage them as well.

Thank you for your understanding of this process and now we'll take the first caller.

Coordinator: We will now begin the comments session. If you would like to provide a comment, please press Star 1 and record your name at the prompt. To withdraw your comment, please press Star 2. Again, provide a comment please press Star 1 and record your name. One moment please for our first comment.

Our first question comes from Kawika Riley. Your line is open.

Kawika Riley: Aloha. Aloha to Secretary (Sarri), Mr. Cummings, Miss Romero, and all of those on the call. Mahalo or thank you for the opportunity to comment on whether the Obama administration should provide equal treatment to native Hawaiians as indigenous people through this rulemaking. My name is Kawika Riley and I'm the Chief Advocate for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. In that capacity I am pleased to provide the following administrative testimony.

Allow me to note at the onset that OHA's intention is to provide a thorough detailed official comment in writing at a future date. That written comment will be the full and official reflection of OHA's position on this important issue. As it has for years, OHA stands in strong support of a federal rule for the taking of other federal actions that would create a process by which native Hawaiians would finally, finally have the right to pursue a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

Should that option exist at all? We believe that that is the essential question that is before us this morning. Not whether native Hawaiians should choose to walk through that door, but whether or not there should be a door at all. Currently, there is not.

Despite well over 200 acts of Congress addressing native Hawaiians. Despite the fact that the special legal and political relationship with native Hawaiians is codified in Title 20 and 42 of the United States Code. And despite the fact that native Hawaiians never relinquished our inherent sovereignty. Despite all these facts and so many others, there is no door for native Hawaiians to walk through today, there is only a wall.

A wall between native Hawaiians and our ability to provide stronger protection for the trust of power leaking, our royalty handed down to us. And federal programs and other programs that provide critical investments in our

ability to perpetuate our culture, to revitalize our language, to provide services to those among us who have the most need, there is only a wall. A wall between native Hawaiians and our ability to hold elections and determine our leaders without being sued by nationally funded groups who argue that native Hawaiians don't have the right to organize. There is only a wall.

A wall between native Hawaiians and our ability to form a government that is accountable to us and make our own decisions and define ourselves to move forward. Should this wall be replaced by a door? OHA believes that the answer is yes.

Our unwavering support springs from our board's determination that the reestablishment of a government-to-government relationship with the United States is also the most viable action that could be taken to protect and expand native Hawaiian rights and resources under federal law.

OHA takes seriously its position as a fiduciary of native Hawaiian assets as well as its role as an advocate for native Hawaiians both of which compel us to speak on this issue. Additionally, we believe that a very minimum, given the United States' role in denying native Hawaiian's wealth determination for well over a century, the proposal should not include requirements or thresholds that are more restrictive or burdensome than what is applied to other indigenous people.

We are asking for equal treatment. We are asking for fairness and justice. And we've been asking for a long time. In our official comments, once again, we intend to be specific with any concerns that we have in any instance where there is a concern with the proposed rule. We will propose alternatives for the Department to consider.

Once again, we stand in strong support of establishing a final rule and we urge the Obama administration to carefully consider the amendments, the mana'o, the thought (unintelligible).

Coordinator: And thank you for your comments, your time is up. Our next comment comes from Anthony Aguiar. Your line is open. Please spell your name.

Anthony Aguiar: A-G-U-I-A-R. I'm sure you can spell Anthony. Uh, I come from (Pekah). I lived here all my life and I oppose anything that's being - makes us into an Indian tribe. I oppose anything that (Robin Danner) is pushing. I oppose everything that's going on right now because as a person of 25% Hawaiian blood, I do not have anything to say and I have nothing to gain from this process

This process is meant only to separate us, the local people, Hawaiians with koko, from our property, our water rights, and our family, making things harder for us. I would like to reiterate, I oppose any going to become Hawaiian Indian tribe, anything under (Robin Danner) or whatever she is pushing because she has nothing except herself to consider and every time she negotiates financial statements, she makes 20%.

I oppose what is going on because my children, my grandchildren, my great-grandchildren will have nothing to gain from this entire effort entity. And all we have to do is look at the history of how the American government, federals have treated all American tribes. Just look at the Dakotas. They put the Dakota Indians up there. Then when there was gold that was discovered up there, they kicked the Indians out.

All we have to do is look at Wounded Knee, how in the dead of winter the American government with the soldiers came up and killed a bunch of Indians

just standing around and dancing. I realize there might have been more to it, but that's all they were doing.

In closing, I would like to say again I oppose any relationship with the government that makes us an Indian tribe. I oppose anything that (Robin Danner) has to say. I would like to see something that has me -- as a person-- of Hawaiian ancestry who has been here since time immemorial and I can trace my koko back to time before Captain Cook came here. I am not being considered and I want to be considered.

I thank you very much. Aloha.

Oh. This didn't go on? I don't know. I wasn't prepared to go on this long and I am longwinded. Um, so, yeah, that's it now.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Kamealoha Smith). Your line is open.

Kamealoha Smith: Aloha. My name is Kamealoha Smith. I'm calling from Anahola (Kapaa), Kaua'i. My name is spelled K-A-M-E-A-L-O-H-A and my last name is Smith.

This testimony is by no means an endorsement on this process. I do not consent to any process that comes from outside of our nation and I'm testifying under duress.

I am a Kanaka Maoli, also known as an aboriginal Hawaiian. I do not consent to my name being used in any process that could affect, reduce, or relinquish any Hawaiian claims to an independent Hawaiian nation, what that is called, and believe that complete independence and/or status quo where citizens of both the United States and independent Hawaii is the best path for our people.

I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for establishing a government-to-government relationship with the native Hawaiian community, also known as establishing a federally recognized tribe. I am a Kanaka Maoli, also referred to as an aboriginal Hawaiian.

I do not have enough information at this time -- which I stated before -- and do not give my informed consent to allow (unintelligible) to use my name to create a constitution for our people at this time. I do not support the creation of a process that has more trust in our community with a Hawaiian (unintelligible).

I do support the creation of a process that has more trust in our community where Hawaiian people are free to exercise our human rights to self-determination. I specifically object to parts of the proposal that would allow a role of native Hawaiians certified by the State of Hawaii Commission on the (unintelligible) and used by Nai Aupuni to participate who can and who cannot participate. My understanding is that all the 120 three or four thousand people that are registered, over 60% of those people are seeking from other roles other than the Kaniolowalu.

And I also object to subjecting ourselves on to question the rules that reestablish the formal government-to-government relationship as a rule of text, the titlist jurisdiction, and the status of our lands and property in Hawaii. Apparently that's about 900,000 acres here in the Hawaiian Islands and over 88 million acres of Marine National Monument. The only land that's included is the proposed a team to me (unintelligible).

The rules also do not provide for any compensation for any past wrongs. And there's been no meaningful complication in Hawaii about the Department of Interior advancement a proposed rule meeting.

Just my personal belief, but I think the federal government and the Obama administration should focus on fulfilling the current trust responsibility to include apparently over 200 different separate acts of legislation as those particular pieces of legislation are not doing so well right now and, in my opinion (unintelligible).

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments, your time is up. Our next comment comes from Jade Danner Jones. Your line is open.

Jade Danner Jones: Mahalo. Again, my name is Jade Danner Jones and I would like to first thank all of you that have been working very hard on the federal side to bring forward this rule. It is a long time overdue and it's something that the people of Hawaii have been supporting and working for for more than 20 years really.

I think that overall the rule is very good in terms of the terms. I appreciate the high standards for participation and the high standards for ensuring that the government that is recognized by the United States should hold on to walk through that door can - will have to have done the necessary work to demonstrate that it represents the collective will of Hawaiians.

There is really only one particular area that I am - that I would like to see a little more work on and it's the section that allows the Secretary of the Interior to extend the deadline indefinitely. I would prefer some more definition, whether that be limited in terms of the number of times she can extend a given

deadline or a limitation to the length of time that she can extend the deadline or both.

I will be submitting my comments in writing as well. But, again, I wanted to participate today and really just commend you folks for the work that you've done and for the Obama administration's commitment to not just recognizing that there is something long - there was a longstanding injustice but them to really doing the hard work that it takes to get us to a point where we are laying the groundwork for actually solving that injustice, getting at the heart of it, and beginning the process of reconciliation and healing.

I believe strongly in the power of self-determination. I think that once our people have a recognized right to govern our own affairs, we will be able to demonstrate much more progress and that our programs and services can be used more efficiently with better results, and we can begin to address those issues that have not yet even come to the table less the fact that it is very difficult for Hawaiians to live in Hawaii because of the economics.

And so I think our government can help to bring land -- and those kind of issues -- available to Hawaiians so that we can be home in our homelands and fulfilling our kuleana to the special place (unintelligible).

Coordinator: And thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Raos Mehay Goodness). Your line is open.

(Raos Mehay Goodness): Aloha. You know, I'm (Raos Mehay Goodness). I'm Kanaka Maoli and I currently reside in Brooklyn, New York. I would like to state a few things and some questions I would like the Department to answer in the future.

First, I'd like to say I've read all the proposals and I feel that in light of the apology law -- which was enacted in 1993 which admitted to the wrongs that were done by the US to the Kingdom of Hawaii -- that the offer on the table to the Department of Interior is completely insufficient for correcting those wrongs.

Second, I'd like to address the specific part of the rules where what would be the minimum voter participation in the affirmative for the Secretary to accept a request for federal recognition. I believe that with the threshold being between 30,000 to 50,000 native Hawaiians to vote in the affirmative on a governing document, those numbers were calculated not - basically you state that you're ignoring all the native Hawaiians which live outside of the state of Hawaii.

So basically -- under my calculations -- the appropriate threshold should be between 55,000 to 90,000 votes in the affirmative for our native Hawaiian governing document. If that is not the basis, then you are disempowering all the native Hawaiian people who you consider US citizens which are residing on the continent - the continent in the US. basically.

I do have a third question which is - the question is if a governing document for the native Hawaiian governing entity contains a statement asserting the Hawaiian nation does not accept US sovereignty (sic) over Hawaii and states that there's no waiver of claim to such, would request for federal recognition be accepted by the Secretary? Rejected? Or will you give no comment? So I look forward to an answer to that question.

Mahalo, thank you for your time. Aloha.

Coordinator: And our next question comes from (Kalama Okime Aneow). Your line is open.

(Kalama Mehata Yow): Aloha aina, my name is (Kalama Okime Anehow). I'm of (unintelligible). I would like to Mahalo and thank everyone here and all of our (lahui) including our ancestors for all of the work that they have done for us.

I am Kanaka Maoli. I do not consent to my name being used in any process that will reduce or relinquish any Hawaiian claims to independent Hawaiian nation and believe that complete independence of Hawaii is the best path forward for the people. I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing a "government-to-government relationship" with the native Hawaiian community also known more familiarly by our people as a federally recognized native Hawaiian tribe.

I really completely oppose the utilization of the roll of Kanaio lowalu which is being used by Nai Aupuni to determine and decide who belongs to our lahui. It's absolutely inappropriate. What happened was Kanaio lowalu at most was able to gather 40,000 names. Some say only 19,000. As a result of that, the goal was to have 200,000 (unintelligible). OHA rolled over three other programs without the informed consent -- or even the notification -- of the people who are on that registry.

That is completely unethical and in violation of the International Standards of the rights of people like Kanaka Maoli to self-determination. I object to the state of Hawaiian government entity to supposedly become subject to the United States Congress complete authority of outline of the DOI.

I strongly oppose the role that we are going to be incorporated within the United States. I do not believe that this is the best path forward for our people. Currently, the majority of our people are not clear about what the rules are. Right now 80% of our people will be left without rights. Currently, taken from the actual documents from OHA describing the process, it says this process is to have 80% of our people “waive their right and the right of their children and descendants to be legally and politically acknowledged as native Hawaiians.”

And as a result, they also be excluded from being granted rights of inclusion, which includes citizenship, rights of participation which is called voting, and right to potential benefits that may come with citizenship. Also, for example, land use rights, monetary payments, scholarships, this is aole pono not righteous. What this process is doing, what (unintelligible) is doing currently is looking at excluding the rights of all of my ancestors, the rights of myself, and the rights of all of my descendants to be able to be a part of lahui .

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next question comes from (David Kuglilata). Your line is open.

(David Kuglilata): Yes, my name is (David Kuglilata). First of all, I want to say that my testimony today is by no means an endorsement of this process. I wholeheartedly object to being forced under duress to consent to any process that comes from the Department of Interior of the United States, the Republic of Hawaii, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and their representative (Maggie Pullman).

I am a Kanaka Maoli. That is known as an aboriginal Hawaiian. I do not consent my name and the name of my relatives being used in any process that could affect or relinquish any Hawaiian claims to an independent Hawaiian

nation. I believe that complete independence for Hawaii is our best and only path forward for our people.

I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing the government-to-government relationship with the native Hawaiian community, also known as the federally recognized native Hawaiian tribe. I am a Kanaka Maoli. I do not have information at the time -- enough information at this time -- and do not give my informed consent to allow my opponent to use my name to create a constitution for the people at this time.

I do, however, support the Hawaiian kingdom and our sovereignty and an independent nation state and creating a process of trust in our community where the Hawaiian people have the right to freely choose a sovereignty and international politics status with no external compulsion or interference.

I object to the subjecting the Hawaiian governing entity to the United States Congress plenary authority and strongly oppose a portion of the rule that states reestablishment of the former government-to-government relationship will not affect the title jurisdiction and status of federal land and property in Hawaii which amounts to again - the other caller said 898,637 acres in the main Hawaiian island and over 88 million acres of our Marine National Monument.

The proposed rule does not include any of the land except possibly for (Kahoolawe) and because the state currently provides the state show transfer management and control of that island and its water - the sovereign need of Hawaiian entity upon its recognition by the United States and the state of Hawaii. The proposed rule does not provide for compensation of any past wrongs. I'm also concerned there's no meaningful consultation is occurring

on this process to love Hawaii while the Department of Interior entered in disaster (unintelligible).

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Randy Aki). Your line is open.

(Randy Aki): Aloha everybody. This is (Randy Aki). I want to say that I oppose the opening of this process. I think the time is not right for the DOI to create this rule. There has been no meaningful consensus amongst native Hawaiians in our own communities to question whether or not this is the option for us.

Any push for this recognition has come from state agencies, the Office of Foreign Affairs, senators Akaka (Inouye), the governors of Hawaii. Those are state agencies and not representatives of native Hawaiians as whole. The small groups that have coalesced to support this process and petitioned it are also greatly affiliated with either federal funding, state funding, or the state of Hawaii organization.

Therefore, this whole process is being undertaken sort of in a vacuum, an educational communications vacuum in Hawaii. The average native Hawaiian doesn't understand the process. Doesn't understand the ramifications -- either beneficial or otherwise -- that may come about with federal recognition, as well as the discussion that others have raised with regard to the possibility of independence.

There has been no meaningful consultation. The last group meeting that happened was in 2014 when everyone came out to testify against this - at the DOI meeting and prior to that it was 1999. So there have been no community meetings. As a group we have not developed our consensus of what our

priorities are, where we'd like to pursue our activities, under which sort of agents we'd like to sort of see our, our self-government sort of progress.

Therefore this DOI is just completely premature and is not beneficial to the self-determination of native Hawaiians. It actually creates more division within the community as various groups have to sort of confront one another and work against each other in various environments. Instead, we could be working together.

This premature move is potentially motivated by land claim settlements that many have predicted that the state of Hawaii is interested in. Therefore, this whole entire process has just been sort of, you know, pulled apart and pulled in one direction by state agencies. Thank you.

Coordinator: And thank you for your comment. Our next question/comment comes from Anthony Aguiar. Your line is open.

Anthony Aguiar: This is Anthony Aguiar. Someone gave me a second chance so I will do it. This whole thing started in 1893 when the haoles decided to overtake the government. They threw out Queen Liliuokalani. But we have -- our history showed in 1824 -- a man named Timothy (Opopolaho) went to Europe by himself and got the English government, the Swiss government, and the French government to sign treaties with us that we are a nation.

Then we were overthrown and now President - oh, excuse me, President Cleveland made an inspection because he was asked by Queen Liliuokalani to do that. And he sent a man named (Doug Peer) to Hawaii and that man made a report and it's on record and that record says that this is an illegal overthrow of a recognized government. And we have been fighting that ever since.

So anything to change that from a sovereign government to an Indian tribe I oppose. Now coming to the future in 1897, the Kue petition was signed by 20,000 people. There were 60,000 signatures all together. But the federal government would only let us put in 20,000. And at the time that this happened, the population of Hawaiians, not Hawaiians natives, but Hawaiian citizens was 80,000. Of those 80,000, 60,000 said no, they don't want to have anything to do with the United States.

More recently the DOI came down to Hawaii and went from Waimea where I live on the island of Kauai to down to (zero) and everyone they talked to said no, we don't want - do not want to be recognized as an Indian tribe. That we are a sovereign nation that goes back to 1894. We are a sovereign nation.

We do not deserve to be treated this way like American Indian. You have never treated the American Indians correctly. They're still begging to get what they want and they're still being thrown out of their land when something of value has been found. But we do not want that. All you want from us is our land. We want to say what we want to do with it. To us family, land, and water is important.

And if you go back to our ahupua'a, we are the people that believed in everything and we had a relationship with our Queen that is better than anything you folks have ever had with your President or anyone else that represents the federal government.

And the federal government, America should not be called the United States of America, it should be called the United States of Corporations because the lobbyists, the corporations talk to the lobbyists, the lobbyists talk to the Congressional people, and laws get passed.

We, the people, do not have anything to say about it and we, the people, are losing constantly. We have nothing to do in the last te- in the Republican party, the Republicans are all saying we need to - we (unintelligible).

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. Our next question comes from (Kolama Okahina Meho). Your line is open.

(Kolama Okahina Meho): Aloha. This is (Kolomos) and I can speak on behalf of (Ohana Kola). There's so many things and so many information that are not being said by our people. I think it's very important to realize that we had thousands of people that came out to the DOI to orally testify opposing the creation of a federally recognized tribe.

Thousands of our people were there testifying. It does not appear that their testimonies were counted. I would like to ask were those testimonies counted by the DOI because according to our own estimation, 90% of our people testified against federal recognition.

But according to sources released for the DOI, you guys state 70%. These hearings were public and released and watched throughout the island. You have completely lost any type of credibility by claiming 70% of our people are pro federal recognition. Look at the people in this, too.

This, you are proposing at this point to create a federally recognized tribe. You have the rules that you have proposed. How are you accessing the word of the people? How are you accessing the 400,000 Kanaka Maoli who are not on the list?

It here at teleconference, how many people are in this queue? You have the Office of Foreign Affairs. We have Jade Danner. And we have three people

from the community. There is a complete disconnect from our community. This process is not accountable to our people. We also see that the process that is going through the (unintelligible), vote right now to create a constitution is following exactly the requirements of the Department of Interior regulations to qualify for a federally recognized tribe.

But, at the same time, those in (unintelligible) are stating that they will provide all options. However, they are intentionally excluding the vast majority of our people who are not signing up not just because they are pro independent, but because they have not seen the trust of our people. Not in the trust of our people. That's because of the way that things have been happening all along from the very beginning to (Netenyelpeni) has been without our consent, utilizing the names of our people.

Currently, our researchers are looking preliminarily at some data and so that thousand -- potentially thousands -- of beings on the list are deceased. We have also had reports from our community that those who are wanting to remove (Kapuna) from the list have been denied by both Nai Aupuni and (Kanaiolowalu). We have not been able to confirm this because we have not been - no official statements have been released by either (Nai Aupuni) or (Kanaiolowalu).

Now, there's also to predict as well as the vast majority of our people who are on that list are still on there without their consent. This is not a certified list. This does not reflect the will of our people. Our people have the right (unintelligible).

Coordinator: Thank you for our comment. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Randy Aki). Your line is open.

(Randy Aki): Aloha. This is (Randy Aki). I also want to emphasize that I do not agree with the minimum thresholds for participation in the DOI rule. There are 500,000 native Hawaiians in the United States and Hawaii. And these minimum thresholds, anything less than half, and even half of the above 18 population would still require somewhere around 150,000 to 170,000 to be in favor of.

Anything less than that is not a majority. And to call the - to call a process that has the threshold set lower than that cannot identify the underlying group as native Hawaiians because native Hawaiians -- as we define ourselves -- are defined on our ancestry and so we consider everyone who is part of our lahui to be our lahui, our family.

Therefore, in setting the arbitrarily low numbers does not do a service to any of us. It, in fact, creates a further division. So I would really, really put to the DOI that these numbers are unbelievably low for the native Hawaiian population -- even for the adult voting population -- it's an incredibly low number in order which to trigger sort of the federal recognition of native Hawaiian.

And while this may be a big number in other contexts, specifically in the American Indian context because we know that the median size of American Indian tribe there's somewhere around 3,000 people living on reservations and the nearest - the two nearest population of American Indian federally recognized tribes are the Navajo and the Cherokee. Native Hawaiians would effectively swamp that number and definitely swamp most of the other 555 federally recognized governments in the United States.

So again, we are a big population. We have not developed our consensus on this and creating these arbitrarily small rules is just going - standards, are going to cause decades and decades of trouble in the native Hawaiian

community. Our situation is completely unique to that of all the other indigenous people in the United States. And rushing this process is just unconscionable because our situation is so different, because the lack of education, because the lack of consensus building, because of the lack of community building on the ground in Hawaii, on the continental United States has not occurred.

Another point taken point, there's over 70,000 native Hawaiians living in California. Again, that would swamp the size of essentially many American Indian tribes in the Continental US in terms of our size, and we have not effectively dealt with those native Hawaiians, native Hawaiians living up and down the West Coast as well as those living in the interior of the United States. So again (unintelligible).

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. And please, if you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please press Star 1 and record your name at the prompt. And our next question comes from (Kealii Lopez). Your line is open.

(Kealii Lopez): This is (Kealii Lopez). I'm calling on behalf of Imua Hawaii. We're an independent nonprofit organization made up of native Hawaiian leaders and organizations. First of all, thank you so much for the work that you've put into the rules. Um, we are very clear that you've been thoughtful thinking through a lot of comments that were received by Department of Interior and I understand (unintelligible) occurred in writing.

I would also like to make sure folks are clear that just - whether there's a lot of participation on this call or not, many of my people - people to commitment (unintelligible). Imua Hawaii supports the Department of Interior rule that a

native Hawaiian government could use to create a formal government-to-government relationship with the United States.

This would afford native Hawaiians a greater role in determining the future of our land, our people, and our culture. We further support the United States commitment that the rule would not undermine fundamental retained inherent other reorganized needed government.

The draft rule does not harm the claim of the native Hawaiian people. In the rule, the rule really does affirm native Hawaiians as a political -- not racial -- community that has a special legal and political status. The affirmation would strengthen the protections against legal threats to program the entitlements that benefit native Hawaiians.

From the new Hawaii perspective, the establishment of a DOI rule would offer native Hawaiians what every major group of indigenous people in the United States enjoys.

To clarify concerns that I think you're hearing, I would like to make clear that although many people did testify in opposition in person at the hearing last year, an overwhelming number of people did submit written testimony in support of the administrative rule.

With that, I appreciate the fact that you - the Secretary's staff did draft rules that were responsive to the feedback of many of the people who did testify - submit testimony.

Specifically the rules do not engage in the Secretary or the Department of Interior being involved in determining what the form of government is for

native Hawaiians. It's been clearly left to native Hawaiians to -- in fact -- determine our own government entity.

Additionally, the rule does not call for the Department of Interior being involved in the development of that and, in fact, made clear your support of the fact that native Hawaiians want to be able to create our own governance structure, develop our own constitution, and the rules allow for that. More than anything, what the rule, what the rule is especially call for at is it does not limit ability of the native Hawaiian people.

Coordinator: Thank you for our comment. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Makoa Anakalea). Your line is open.

(Makoa Anakalea): Aloha kakou. My name is (Mcorra Ponalini Komalu Anakalea). And I from Kaneohe and I am Kanaka Maoli. My first question is who am I speaking with? I did come in person to the capitol hearing, but I do want to be introduced to who exactly, DOI, what are your names?

Secondly, what are the standards the federal government consider will make sense to reject a request from the Hawaiian people? That's the problem right there. How are you going to tell us what to do with (unintelligible), seriously?

And third, can you answer some questions? (Unintelligible) (Alahola) he had asked some questions, you know. We want some answers from the conferencing going on.

Coordinator: And thank you for your comments. Our next question/comment comes from (Pang Victor). Your line is open.

(Pang Victor): Aloha. My name is (Victor Kaidi Pang). I was grown Wailuku, Maui. I presently reside in Huntington Beach, California. And I am a native Hawaiian CEO of the Pacific Islander Health Partnership based in Orange County, California. I am also a member of California Hawaiian Pacific Club and a founder of the Mainland Council of Hawaiian Civic Club, otherwise known as (Nolama Kala Por).

I support the DOI rules because it will provide the best pathway for all native Hawaiians including those that are on the continent to protect our native Hawaiian funding programs and health and education.

The federal government has always - has recognized a special trust relationship with native Hawaiians through its more than 150 laws. And it has not recognized a formal government-to-government relationship. I support the DOI rule to realize this process. Mahalo nui loa.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from Jade Danner Jones. Your line is open.

Jade Danner Jones: Aloha. I just wanted to address a few things. I think I agree with a lot of comments that our community needs more time. But I do not think that that means the DOI should stop its progress. The existing rules or proposal allow for our community to take whatever time we need to get organized and - but it more importantly resolves a disparity in federal law that has been -- for too long -- the United States turned its policy toward self-determination, but toward supporting self-determination and self-governance rights of indigenous people more than 40 years ago.

And it is time for the United States to make sure that that policy is open in the first way to native alliance should we choose to access it. We are the only federally recognized indigenous people without an ability to get a government-to-government relationship and, frankly, we are the only indigenous people in the United States -- recognized or not -- without a pathway for recognition. And that is something that the DOI needs to solve whether Hawaiians ultimately decide to walk through that door or not, as a matter of federal parity, as a matter of equal protection. So I wanted to address that issue.

I also wanted to address the fact that the DOI rule - one of things that's very good about it is it does not talk about any of the specific processes. There are some concerns with (Kanuiolwalu) as several of the other folks are talking about. But the DOI rule doesn't say (Kanuiolowalu), instead, it sets a standard for any role that is a good standard that honors the trust responsibility that the United States has already acknowledged with the native Hawaiian people both in segments and in wholes.

And so I think that's a very good thing, And I think we need to - I'd like the DOI to stay focused on those ideas because I think they are reflective of wanting to see a government that is well-supported by the people and is legitimately formed, come forward. Whether that comes forward the (Nai Aupuni) process or not is not determined by this rule, nor should it be.

We need to do the work we need to do in our communities and we need you, at the federal level, to do the work you need to do so that you are ready to receive our petition whenever, if ever, we submit it. And that's just a matter of parody and federal law. And again, I want to commend you all. I know this has been a difficult issue and you folks have conducted yourselves in the highest professional regard. So I do appreciate that very much.

I think that's all I wanted to say at this time.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Again, to make a comment, please press Star 1 and record your name. Our next comment comes from (Shayne Cully). Your line is open.

(Shayne Cully): Yeah, you know, I just wanted to say that I just really object to subjecting the native Hawaiian governing entity for the Congress's plenary authority. And the reason I'm saying that is because the way this process is really being rushed by, I call political polymongers within the state, politically connected people within the state.

I mean, the whole way that this thing came down, including like almost 80% of our native Hawaiian people, you know, I totally oppose the rule as it stands. And for one reason, that there's no land that is even being offered up on this table for native Hawaiians even though we do have rights to close to two million acres of land in Hawaii, but there's no passing rule about any (unintelligible) to any land to that extent.

I really believe that there just needs to be more time in the community, more meaningful time. I do believe that this is totally a violation as far as the rule that you folks are proposing (unintelligible) about issue of our right to self-determination. And really it's just that we really need more time within our own community to look at a way on agreement, fundamental issues and fundamental points of view, talking about the problems with self-determination.

You know, my aloha goes out to our Indian brothers and sisters in the continent. What I have to say here that we are not Indians. We have a very

different history. You know, we've had treaties with over, you know, over a hundred countries from all over the world, including the United States of America. Any type of relationship with America should really be premised upon what the homeland people see appropriate and not what the government or what, you know, their visit should be. It really should come from the Hawaiian people.

I think that this whole process is being rushed. Their people are going to benefit from this whole thing. You know, I'm even going towards tend to - this is distinguished as a political scam in the way that this come to fruition.

Um, the money's overspent and the whole millions of Hawaiian trust dollars used to go up there and lobby the DOI and to lobby the Obama administration in very dishonest ways. I think again that if you really supported true Hawaiian self-determination, we would stop, pull the brakes on this thing, and give us more time.

There's 80% of Hawaiians, you can talk to any Hawaiian walking in the street. I work with Hawaiians who are part of the Hawaiian community and many of them do not understand any of this, or even have the time to understand any of this. And so it's really, what you really, you know, view that as being very problematic.

If you want any kind of meaningful con - you know, consultation with the Hawaiian community, the thing to do is to wait and give us more time to talk about these issues that are very important when we're talking about self-determination and sovereignty. There's a lot that these people want in that particular area. But actually mahalo nui loa and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice my opinion, or my thoughts.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Kayana Pang). Your line is open.

(Kayana Pang): Aloha. My name is )Kayana K- Kaylana King). I was born in Newport Beach, California and I'm a business major at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. I support the DOI rule because it'll provide Hawaiians more opportunity for education and my future as a young Hawaiian. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Our next comment comes from (Kami Lewis Smith). Your line is open. Our next comment comes from (Jacob Aki). Your line is open.

(Jacob Aki): Aloha mai kakou. My name is Jacob Brian Aki and I stand in support of the Department of Interior's rule. I support a rule that a native Hawaiian government could use to create a formal government-to-government relationship with the US which would afford naïve Hawaiians a greater role in determining the future of our land, our people, and our culture. I further support the US commitment that the rule would not undermine the fundamental retained inherent sovereign powers of a reorganized native Hawaiian government.

A rule would reaffirm that native Hawaiians are a political -- not racial -- community that has a special legal and political status. Such reaffirmation would strengthen protection against legal threats to programs and entitlements that benefit native Hawaiians. The establishment of a DOI rule would offer native Hawaiians with every major group of people of indigenous status to the US enjoy a means to establish a government-to-government relationship with the US.

I just wanted to thank all, you know, all of those involved from the Obama administration to the Department of Interior to our brothers and sisters from

across in the country who have supported us in this long place for many, many years.

Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Pohai Ryan). Your line is open.

(Pohai Ryan): Aloha. Good morning to you. My name is (Pohai Ryan). I was raised on the island of Molokai and have been working to several roll calls for the those of us who are (unintelligible) and kupuna are very familiar with all of this. The previous callers mentioned not enough time to educate. Aole. We had lots of time. There comes a time when we have to take responsibility individually to do that ourselves. With that argument, no time will probably be a good time.

But I totally support working with the DOI. It saddens me to hear people who do not feel the Hawaiian people are worthy of an equal relationship with the DOI to help them help us.

I do not support the statements that have been made that the majority of our people do not support it. There's no documentation, and it's not factual and cannot be proved. Also, I do not support monarchy. I do not support those who have been claiming for decades who have not changed nor offered up a base economic plan.

We are a thriving, beautiful culture with many intellectual and creative aspects that are not being realized in a positive way to help us. And working through with the DOI is one way to go on that pathway. I agree that we should continue to work with the DOI. Many of our kupuna have served and worked

in this country as Hawaiians and are proud of it and have earned their way. They do want to see us to control our own resources and manage it better.

But to claim that majority of our Hawaiian people do not support the DOI is incorrect and cannot be proven. In my opinion, it's a statement that's made so that people continue to be confused.

But I think that it's time for people to become individually sovereign and work on strengthening each other that we buy it as a people and not focus on ego-centric leadership that's being offered and has been offered for the last few decades.

It is correct we are not a tribe and that is why we need to help the DOI understand what it is that we are working for. And the aha is part of this process that will empower us so we all have to go into it with open minds and not sabotage in mind which can be said for both sides. I don't understand the comment about political players when anyone interested in this is political in their own way because that's what politics is.

But I just want to restate that people have submitted support for DOI, it's in support and that is the data that we should use. A lot of our Hawaiian people are busy earning a living and do not have the luxury of attending community meetings or do not want to be humiliated by others who do not agree with them in public.

Thank you for continuing with this process and for actually everyone who has called in to share the mana'o. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Kaylene Sheldon). Your line is open.

(Kaylene Sheldon): Aloha kakou. My name is (Kaylene Kowela Sheldon) and I'm from (Krow Ava) and presently I'm in Kahana Valley right now because my daughter was (unintelligible). Mahalo for giving me this opportunity. Number 1, I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure firmly establishing a government-to-government relationship with the native Hawaiian community.

Number two, I specifically object to those portions of the proposed rule that would allow a roll of native Hawaiians certified by a state of Hawaii commission like Kanaiolowalu that is being used by Nai Aupuni to determine participation when an admitted 62% of the approximate 123,000, or roughly 76,000 names on the roll came from different OHA lists, a registry without the free power and informed consent of those who sign onto those prior lists and registries, including one registry used to qualify for OHA programs which is loans, grants and scholarships. I object that my father and my family was on the list and they are now deceased.

Number three I also object to subjecting any of native Hawaiian government entities to Congress plenary authority. Before I strongly oppose a portion of the rule that states that reestablishment of the formal government-to-government relationship would not affect the title, jurisdiction or status of federal land, the property in Hawaii which amounts to 898, 637 acres in the main Hawaiian islands and over 88 million acres of the Papahanamoku Marine National Monument. Number five.

The proposed rule does not include any land except possibly for Kahoolawe because state law currently provides the state shall transfer management and control of the islands and is what is needed point (unintelligible) applying it direct (unintelligible) United States and the state of Hawaii.

The proposed rule does not provide for compensation of any past wrongs or reparations. Number 7 I am also concerned that no meaningful consultation is occurring on this process throughout Hawaii. Or the Department of Interior has issued an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking and hold public meetings out here asking for responses to specific questions. Rule meetings have been scheduled to explain a proposed rule and discuss its implications.

The only public meetings are by teleconference receive public comment. Number 8 instead just have a government to focus on fulfilling the trust responsibility there utterly failing right now such as instituting a breach of trust suit as provided for in Section 5F of the administration's act and when I reserve the right to supplement my comments in writing.

Number 10, the United States, if you look at their history of how they became a nation, they stood - they used to stand for justice and then asking the DOI to also make things pono. Your culture is different from our culture and maybe some of us are for the DOI. But it - and that means that they're also beginning to create an elite group of Hawaiians and not including all Hawaiians.

In our culture we include everyone, we're a collective people, we are not just an elite group and you may have a history of creating those elite groups. But I am going to tell you I will oppose - I will oppose and I will fight to the last aloha aina. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Dorian Kabanting). Your line is open.

(Dorian Kabanting): Aloha kakou. First of all, I want to thank all the people Native hawaiians that are calling in today the Kanaka Maoli that are calling in today who protest

this Nai Aupuni and federal recognition process. Thank you and Mahalo so much.

I just want to voice my opinion that this federal recognition from the history of federal recognition and the things that are done to these native tribes. I do not comply with anything that the Department of Interior or OHA, Nai Aupuni, we will protest against it. It is not of our Queen, it is against our kingdom and it is not for the Hawaiian people. It is for the United States to control our resources and the things that we have left for our keiki.

With that being said, I just would like to say that the Danners do not speak for the Lahui, for the native Hawaiian and Kanaka Maoli population. They speak for their own organization. So please take that into consideration and mahalo for hearing me today.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Again, to make a comment, please press Star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Wendy Hee). Your line is open.

(Wendy Hee): Mahalo. My name is (Wendy Hee). I'm a native Hawaiian who is in favor of the proposed Department of Interior rule. I'm the former executive director of the Native Hawaiian Education Council which was created by the Native Hawaiian Education Act. Congress has provided \$30 million annually under this Act to fund education programs for the benefit of native Hawaiians.

These programs range from preschool, like (unintelligible), the programs developed by partners in development. Keiki first steps that is provided by (N Peace). It goes from preschool all the way to college and post-graduate scholarship programs. The Native Hawaiian Education Act is just one of many federal programs that benefit native Hawaiians. And I believe that federal

recognition of native Hawaiian – or of a native Hawaiian government will protect those federal programs as well as a number of state of Hawaii programs and legislation that specifically address native Hawaiians.

For example, recognizing Hawaiian as the official language of Hawaii. Having native Hawaiians being beneficiaries of the Ceded and Public Land Trust and protection of all our traditional and customary rights. I believe that the Department of Interior rules open up a way for us to protect all that we have. And I think it's important at this time because just looking at the demographics of this state, we are not -- native Hawaiians -- are not in the majority. We need to protect what we have.

I appreciate your allowing us to voice our opinion and hope that we are able to protect the things that we already have and that we can build our own native Hawaiian government that would be recognized by the United States. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Melinda Finoto Palet). Your line is open.

(Melinda Finoto Palet): Aloha. My name is (Melinda Finoto Palet). And I am calling from (Hulio O oahoo). This testimony that I am providing is by no means an endorsement of this process. I do not consent to any process that comes from outside our own niche and community. I'm testifying under duress.

I am Kanaka Maoli, also known as aboriginal Hawaiian, also known as indigenous Hawaiian. I do not consent to my name being used in any process that could affect, reduce, or relinquish any Hawaiian claims of an independent Hawaiian nation and believe that complete independence for Hawaii is the best path forward for our people.

I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing a government-to-government relationship with the native Hawaiian community, also known as establishing a federally recognized native Hawaiian tribe. I am Kanaka Maoli, also referred to as aboriginal Hawaiian, so I object to the rule.

I specifically object to the part of the proposed rule that will not (unintelligible) of native Hawaiians certified by the state of Hawaii Commission like Kana'iolo'owalu and used by Nai Aupuni in drafting a constitution and belong to a nation. Kana'iolo'owalu and Nai Aupuni admit that 62% of the approximately 123,000 (Orbra) or roughly 76,000 names on that roll were moved from OHA list that has nothing to do with nation building to registries.

On thousands of Hawaiian names were put on these Kana'iolo'owalu list without pre prior and informed consent, or even notification. Many of the people on the list or deceased or are listed twice. Sometimes three times.

One of the registries used was originally used to qualify for OHA programs such as loans, grants, and scholarships. It is unethical to add people to the roll without their knowledge.

I also object to subjecting the need of Hawaiian governing entities the U.S. Congress Plenary authority complete control. I strongly oppose the portion of the rule that speaks the reestablishment of the formal government to government relationship will not affect the prior jurisdiction or pass a Federal lands or property in Hawaii which amounts to 1/8 million acres in the main Hawaiian islands.

The proposed rule does not include any land except possibly for Kahoolawe because state laws currently provides the state shall transfer management and control of the island and its water to the sovereign native Hawaiian entity upon its recognition by the United States and the State of Hawaii.

The proposed rule does not provide for any compensation for any past wrongs. I am also concerned that no meaningful consultation is occurring on this process throughout Hawaii. While the Department of Interior issued an advanced notice of proposed rule making and held public meetings in 2014...

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Emily Halona Stalin). Your line is open.

(Emily Halona Stalin): Yes, hello. I am the cousin of Joseph Stalin and on the other side I'm Cherokee and Chickasaw. I must disagree with what the United States is proposing.

Hawaii, according to international law is under illegal occupation. It was wrong for the Germans to invade Poland, but now the United States has become Germany imposed and Hawaii has become Poland.

This is wrong that the United States is trying to make you guys take the Hawaiians into a tribe. They're doing exactly what they're doing to our tribe, the Cherokee nation and Chickasaw nation.

Our tribe, the Cherokee nation and Chickasaw nation also disagrees with what the United States is doing. I also must note that the United States is trying so

hard to keep Hawaiians out of these so called rigged elections in keeping the ones who are Americans loyalists. It's wrong.

And, you know, that's all I have to say. You know, I think anyone who is intelligent enough will be against this proposal against what the United States is proposing. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Shelly Minoka). Your line is open.

(Shelly Minoka): (Hawaiian Language Spoken). My name is (Shelly Minoka). I'm from (ahala olina) island of Oahu. I am completely opposed to the DOI rules of the Federal recognition. I testify under duress as I know (unintelligible) legitimacy to this process.

Firstly, the rule is saying that (akha) government to the relationship is a misnomer. What is actually offered as a government to government entity relationship which is not equal status?

And for an actual government to government relationship two independent nature suites which can't be achieved with this rule with Hawaiians under the plenary authority of congress will not be satisfied as the status as the domestic dependent nation and do not consider this a true form of self-determination.

There's not been, you know, primary education to constitute free prior informed consent. And, you know, own U.S. constitution states that governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers to the consent of the governed.

You do not have, nor have you ever had our consent to govern us. The push for federal recognition is the transferring attempt to manufacture our consent enclosed in very obvious or vulnerable (Puka) or a hole in the U.S. claims to Hawaii.

One of the major problems is that it does not allow us to any access to what is now considered a federal land in or is it Section 50.44F. It is clear that the reestablishment of the formal government to government relationship will not affect title, jurisdiction, or status to federal lands and populate Hawaii.

That's not good enough for us because that is how it has been to us those lands being illegally occupied by the U.S. government. So that's not going to work for us. If and when you get a petition from an entity that comes out of that Nai Aupuni process, and I'm confident that you will.

Look closely at how that roll is put together, how that voter list is put together and ask yourself if there can be legitimacy on the list that's made mostly of people who did not know they were placed on that list.

And evident by people getting ballots in the mail wondering what is this and how, I don't know how I even got on this list in the first place. When the DOI came to Hawaii last year for the public hearings there was a historic moment for Hawaiians.

Thousands of people attended unincorporated, no time for talking points, just everyday people showing up to participate. And it was so incredible to see people empowered and you see eloquently our history that has been cheated from us for so long.

So when it came out that the DOI did not consider a comment that told that true history of an independent Hawaii being illegally occupied by the U.S. That those comments were not counted really violated the trust of Hawaiian people. I think you will find that that is why people are not participating in this process now.

People really came sincerely to share that. And the fact that it was announced after the fact that those comments would not be considered it's probably easier. And just, I think it makes people think that the thing is rigged -

The whole thing is rigged and that there can't be a meaningful consultation. So, yes. Basically I guess that's all my thoughts today. But I'm completely opposed to it for those reasons.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with spelling. Our next comment comes from (Kealii Lopez). Your line is open.

(Kealii Lopez): Well, aloha. Thank you for allowing me to speak again. I just wanted to follow up on a couple of things, especially related to comments provided by (Pohai Ryan), and other with regards to there hasn't been enough time.

The reality is we as Hawaiians have been looking to address this issue for well over 120 years. And the issue of sovereignty and the fight for self-determination has been ongoing for well over four decades.

And so for anyone to say there hasn't been enough time, or we need more time to talk, or I'm not sure that as Pohai indicated, that more talk will result in us getting to a better place.

The reality is the administrative rules does not keep us from speaking and talking. If anything it's a door that remains open and gives us an opportunity so that should native Hawaiians choose to have federal recognition be an option, that we can then (unintelligible) why we would limit the options for future Hawaiians. I am unclear about why we would do that.

So, for the Department of Interior, thank you for creating the door, allowing for that door to remain open. As native Hawaiians we have to take advantage of that and look at that as an opportunity for our people.

The reality is with 5,000 people participating in the advanced rule making process, I think that's unprecedented to have that high of participation for administrative rule process.

To say that people aren't aware and don't understand when we had, again, about 5,000 people participating. You can't read the newspaper or, you know, a civil beat, or whatever the case may be without knowing that this process is occurring.

The other issue is I'm clear that there are a lot of concerns related to Na'i Aupuni and Kanaiolowalu. Those are issues that native Hawaiians have to address. It is not an issue related to the department of interiors rule making. And again, I think those are things you clearly want to be able to have the opportunity to address ourselves as native Hawaiians.

And to infuse the whole process with combining DOI's administrative rules for federal recognition with Na'i Aupuni and Kanaiolowalu just confuses the whole process.

I hope (unintelligible). And I appreciate those who do have strong feelings. And I agree that the processes that we select for that self-governance and the constitution of the United States has to be done in a pono way.

But I will ask, you know, I would hope that the Department of Interior, you understand that that issue is clearly separate and I'm sure you're clear of that or somewhat clear of that.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Stephanie Cridello). Your line is open.

(Stephanie Cridello): Thank you. I supported DOI rule that a native Hawaiian government could, needs to create a formal government to government relationship. I think it does create a role in determining the future of our islands, in our culture.

And as a homesteader, lifetime homesteader, I really support the U.S. rule will not undermine the fundamental retained inherent sovereign powers of a reorganized native Hawaiian government.

And it's not racial, but political. And it has a special legal political status and with native Hawaiian programs and entitlements. So that being said, you know, we acknowledge the, I acknowledge the new input received in the native Hawaiian community also. I appreciate everybody's comments and input. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Our next comment comes from (Nadine Thompson). Your line is open.

(Nadine Thompson): I am in an HHCA eligible native Hawaiian as a current beneficiary and a native Hawaiian through the larger community. I would like to provide input regarding ANPRM part 50, 9-29-2015 as follows.

I am providing comments on the concerns over the use of Part 83 regulations as has been applied to native tribes in the continental U.S. Item number 8, Page 29, on the issue of gaming under IGRA and the use of grammar set forth on Pages 41 to 45 regarding the ratification (sic) Process.

And what will be deemed as having a just measure for broad based support for any items brought forth in the political process of self-governance. I understand that native Hawaiians are not and will not be recognized in the same light as the native, as American tribes on the continental U.S.

Pursuant to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit due to our geographic limitations and the history, over 150 federal laws that have already documented special political and trust relationships that our people have with the U.S. nation.

Therefore, it seems to me that the application of Part 83 Regulations may not be applied to our government as it reestablishment is pursued in these modern times.

I have read the response regarding the previously stated issue on limiting our rights to regulate and permit gaming as a reestablished nation. The logic applied is that we are to be subordinate to the laws imposed by the state of Hawaii.

How can we consider ourselves a nation if we are subordinate to state control rather than negotiating this endless implementation as a separate and equal

entity within the boundaries currently recognized as the United States of America.

I am not looking to be affiliated with any tribal nation, or have any existing set of regulations regarding gaming applied to our nation. I certainly believe that we can be treated as separate, and awarded civil rights as a nation to establish what goes on in it.

No nation or person can constantly exist without a means of financial support. Gaming may be that opportunity that provides us a means toward that end. This is not something that some, that another layer of government should be opposing on our nation.

I recognize that there are currently no lands that are under our unique control. As a beneficiary of the HHCA I have a default interest that is subordinate to the control to the U.S., the state of Hawaii, and the county government.

These issues need to be addressed by the nation of Hawaii that should be uniquely administered to our benefit, and not compromised by all of the aforementioned governmental agencies.

To be truly rehabilitated we must be left to organize and implement rules of law that can be clearly of our own making, whether it is related to gaming, land use, or criminal activity.

The reliance of any county, state, or federal agency, to administer or manage our unique affairs is beyond my comprehension. And that's upped by my experience with all the aforementioned agencies due to my and my family's unique situations over the last 25 to 30 years.

Finally, regarding the application of those grammars broad based native Hawaiian support, so delimited by Pages 41 to 45. They appear to be reasonably derived.

However, I do think a review of those numbers as needed for revisiting them should be time sensitive as changes in populations occur in human history. Thank you to give me this opportunity to provide my manao on these matters. Respectfully, (Michael). Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (David Kio Camino Okio). Your line is open.

(David Kio Camano Okio): Aloha. My name is (David Kaiio Camano Okio Lahapriese). ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:15:09). I'm going to start off with which I didn't the last time you guys were here one year ago. (Hawaiian Language Spoken 0:15:22).

No consent. No treaty. Everything you're doing is wrong. You have no right to do it. We stood up back then. We stand up now. You have no right. Be prepared because we will peacefully, civilly be disobedient in this process. Mahalo. (Hawaiian Spoken 0:15:45).

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Lahuwa Kinyow). Your line is open. Aloha. I wanted to submit comments in opposition to the U.S. Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing a government to government relationship with the native Hawaiian community.

I just wanted to touch on a few comments. First of all, claims that there is no documented opposition. There in fact was strong documented opposition in

the advanced rulemaking at the public hearings that were held. So there actually is documented opposition.

I would actually question the documented support for this process. The large documented support for this process is primarily coming from the office of Hawaiian affairs and a select few organizations on Hawaiians who are politically aligned in Washington D.C.

It doesn't reflect the support of the broader community. And I would question those who want to claim that there is broad based support. You show your proof for that kind of support for this process.

Secondly, I want to address the comments that these rules have nothing to do with the KanaioIwalu and the Nau Aupuni process. That's just utterly false. Just go to Rule 50.12A1 Roman Numeral II and it talks about enumeration on a role of native Hawaiians certified by the State of Hawaii Commission, or agency under state law.

That talks about the KanaioIlowalu roll. Also, if you go to 50.12 Section B of the proposed rule. So to give the misinformation as of right now KanaioIwalu and the Nau Aupuni is totally separate is just false.

And those sections of the rule should be removed because there was no large participation. In fact, there was a Civil Beat article that published that 19,000 signed up on their own to participate in the KanaioIlowalu roll. How did they get more participation? They added all prior registries.

Automatically people were added onto the list to swell the numbers. So I would dispute that supposed support of this process and state the roll isn't included in these DOI rules. I would say it is and it should be removed.

Though the argument about time, you know, there's a difference. Time in the sense of history and people getting educated is one thing. This rule comes out when that vast notice of proposed rulemaking there were questions that people were asked to respond to. That's not consultation.

Public hearings like this, to me this is not consultation. Consultation is when we get into discussions about how this rule is going to impact us as a greater community and understanding the implications. That's consultation where we can actually engage in a dialogue. What does conference disciplinary authority need?

What does it mean when we have no title jurisdiction over federal land?  
What's the implication of those? I utterly object to that question of the Rule 50.44f that talks about no jurisdiction or title over federal lands.

Again, that's 890,633,007 acres in the main Hawaiian island, and over 80 million acres of land. These are all portions of the rule that must be removed. And therefore I object to these U.S. DOI proposals. Aloha.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Again, to make a comment please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Anthony Aguiar). Your line is open.

(Anthony Aguiar): Yes. Hello. From all the previous people who are opposing, and I oppose this ruling that the DOI has, you see, we're not stupid are we? We know what we're talking about. The lady just before me gave you stanza and verse. She told you where it is. She told you what the problem is. You need, people need to pay attention.

In fact, we should not be speaking to you folks. We should be speaking to the secretary of state (John Kerry) or someone in his office. Because you folks don't represent the United States. We need, we are a sovereign nation and we need to speak to Secretary (Kerry), not you folks.

You folks are nice people. I don't know you personally, but that's it. You're not our people that we should be talking to. We know what our history is. We know where we came from.

And what we need now is to bring a hope to this because you are accelerating the process so that you can get our land. And we don't want you to have our land. You accelerated the process. You want an example? You gave us two weeks' notice to come down and give oral statements.

And we were only allowed to look at whatever it was you folks sent us. And it was one page. There was no in depth conversation. We couldn't go through it because and that's what made us so angry. What are you treating us like? Stupid people?

Excuse me. The loser is, the L is written on your head. Loser. We're not the losers here. We're not going to be the losers. And you folks have to come to that realization. We are not stupid people. We know what we're doing.

You folks need to give us credit where credit is due. Our queen did establish relationships with England, France, and Switzerland. We know that. And there have been others since then. We know that. We are a nation. You cannot take that away from us. It's in the writing, it's in history.

You cannot just come over here and talk to us like we are simpletons. We know our past history and we know where we're going. You need to get out of our way. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. And our next comment comes from (Rau Nahii Goodness). Your line is open.

(Rau Nahii Goodness): Aloha. I would just like to follow up in some comment that is said before and I would just like to clarify that I do not support the terms contained within the Department of Interior's proposed rules as they have been sent to us.

I would like the department to clarify what exactly is meant by reestablishing a form of government to government relationship. What government exactly are you referring to?

We can only assume that you're discussing, you're referring to the kingdom of Hawaii which the U.S. had a treaty relationship with previously. And since there's been no Hawaiian government that you had a relationship with.

Now I would also like to address the terms in the proposed rulemaking. I looked through this whole document searching, you know, disseminating through pages or whatever it is.

Exactly what is the rationale for the department to propose this to a Hawaiian government, and for us to accept it? I looked through the whole document and I found that it was a more effective implementation of the Department of Interior's trust relationship.

This is the only reason why we should accept this, okay? Well incredibly inadequate, insulting really. Okay. You do go through the following points. There's no transfer of federal land, including Hawaiian home lands.

This means that, you know, there would be no quote "reservation". You state it does not affect lands owned by the State of Hawaii, these so called ceded lands. Not eligible, we would not be eligible for any federal Indian programs.

So, you know, no healthcare. None of those other things. No difference in protection of sacred places. You know, there's nowhere in the document. And in fact, you do state that we would be under congress' plenary authority, which we know that can override any, you know, native tribes rights.

The State of Hawaii, you basically say the State of Hawaii will transfer Kahoolawe. This means you're not giving anything. It's just some of the State of Hawaii's already agreed to, okay.

And by using the term reestablishing a formal government to government relationship, which you also state would be very different from the prior relationship with the Kingdom of Hawaii that the U.S. had.

We can only assume that we are giving up our claims to national sovereignty and independence which to this day, Hawaiians, kanaka maoli and Hawaiian nationals have never surrendered. Okay? So completely, this is, I - it's incomprehensible to me as to why kanaka maoli should accept this deal. Mahalo for your time.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. And if you would like to make a comment please press star 1. Please unmute your phone and record your name with the

spelling. Thank you. We may have a comment from Ms. (Michelon Trainor).  
Your line is open.

(Michelon Trainor): Aloha mai kakou. This is Ms. (Michelon Trainor) again. I called on Wednesday too. Again, I would like to ask the same question that several other people have said, what constitutes broad based support?

On Page 45 of DOI rules it says that you're seeking public comment on this. And the numbers that are used is really underrepresenting the Hawaiian community. These numbers do not reflect enough broad based support in my opinion.

And with the disenrollment of so many Hawaiians from this process because of the unethical means in which the process is taking place right now. I really don't see how this section in the rules, is reflected enough of setting limits on what would constitute broad based support.

Those numbers need to be way higher. Way higher. And again, I do not support section 50.44. This government to government relationship that would make us on the same, in the same position as the relationship with federally recognized tribes is not going to be to Hawaiian's benefits.

Number 1, because that relationship prevents Hawaiians from seeking legal redress against the state, and against the federal government. We wouldn't be able to sue.

We wouldn't be able to be in all of the court cases that we are in right now in the supreme court, in the state supreme court trying to protect our sacred places from the military and from development.

We wouldn't be able to do that if we were under the plenary power of congress and in the same relationship as those tribes. And so why would we want federal recognition? It makes no sense.

And that section also, you know, clearly describes that only members of this native Hawaiian government would be served with those federally funding, funded programs. And so all of the people that are disenrolled, they would not get served.

And so the point is that if a native governing Hawaiian entity is approved by the process, that native Hawaiian governing entity would only serve the people who are members of it.

And it's actually cut out all of the other people that are native Hawaiian. And this is why I totally and absolutely oppose these rulings. And that they - if there is any possibility for us to gain federal recognition it should only be through the Department of State.

And that we never ever gave up our inherent sovereignty. Your own 1993 Apology Bill recognizes and acknowledges that. And therefore the native Hawaiian kingdom still exists.

So we need to be talking to the Department of State. And even though I appreciate all of these opportunities for public comment, our public comment needs to be recognized more than just from the Department of Interior.

And so, and it means something to us. And so we're asking that you listen to us and listen to the people. Not just to the people that are in those organizations supporting federal recognition. There are more people that do

not support federal recognition. And so Mahalo for these comments. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Kalamo Kana Nayhow). Your line is open.

(Kalamo Kana Nayhow): Aloha aina. This is (Kalamo Kana Nayhow). Mahalo again for giving me this opportunity to speak. I would like to address a few of the items that we have talked about so far. Regarding that to, you know, Nai Aupuni being our legitimate voice of the people.

In regards to the numbers, there have been several active community based, broad based supported drives to actively disenroll hundreds, if not thousands of people.

One of our community leaders, (Walter Ritty), publicly and clearly announced his opposition from the process and his withdrawal as a candidate and a member, does need any comment on the roll.

He said that this process was aole pono. It was broadcasted in all the major newspapers as well as television. However, they did not remove his name from the roll. There are thousands of our people who are disenrolling. Where are those numbers? Why was that number not change according to the Nai Aupuni rolls?

The next thing I would like to point out is who gives Na'i Aupuni their right to determine and set the rules of how our people are going to write the constitution? Though currently, as far as we know, Na'i Aupuni was created in December 23, 2014.

It's a very new organization. Since then, they have not named a single director or officer. They do not make their information about its meetings available to the public. There is no indication they've ever held a meeting, as according to their bylaws they're only required to hold one meeting per year.

It has not filed with the Hawaii attorney's office as a charity and has not filed for tax exemption status with the IRA - IRS. Yet, in spite of the lack of history demonstrating an efficacy in our community.

Or trust, or even knowledge of the vast majority of our people about who they are, the organization filed for a multi-million dollar grant with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and was ordered - awarded 2,598,000 by OHA on April 27, 2015.

I'd like to say to the DOI, if I could apply to you gather up the poor people and say that I represent our constitution, will OHA provide me with \$2.6 million? My understanding is that they're about to get another \$900,000 as well. That's a total of more than \$3.5 million dollars to an entity that our community doesn't know and does not trust and for good reason.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Kuhio Lewis). Your line is open.

(Kuhio Lewis): Aloha mai. My name is (Kuhio Lewis). I'm a Native Hawaiian homesteader, a single father, an active homestead and civic club leader. I'm calling to reiterate my thanks to the Department of Interior and the Obama Administration for advancing this rule.

I stand as just one of the thousands who've commented during the ANPRM in support of this rule. I agree with the comments made by (Kealii Lopez), (Jade Danner), (Pohai Ryan), (Jacob Aki).

The establishment of a DOI rule would offer Native Hawaiians what every other major people, indigenous people in the U.S. enjoy a means to establish a government to government relationship with the United States.

Many Native Americans have waited hundreds of years and suffered through generations of pain and suffering and have had no say in the disposition of their lands before receiving federal recognition.

I don't want to wait. I want to make things happen now. After the Organic Act was passed and the right to vote was restored to our Native Hawaiian people, our lahui had to figure out whether or not we have the, we would use that right. Our leaders sought the advice of our queen.

She said, "Now, the U.S. sits in power over me and over you, my dear lahui. What has befallen us is very painful to me. However, it could not be prevented. We have no other direction left to pursue except this unrestricted right given by the U.S. to you, the lahui.

Grasp it and hold it. It's up to you to make things right for all of us in the future." Those are the words of our queen. We need to heed her advice. We need the ability and the power to influence how our lands are being used and what priority should be served.

We need a recognized government that represents our cultural values and serves our interests, and our interests alone. We have marched. We've chanted. We've protested to no end. We have no say. I want to emphasize to

those that are listening on the line that keeping this door open does not close other options to us. It simply opens the door for our future.

I do have substantive comments that I will be submitting in writing. But I want to emphasize to the Interior, please correct the injustice and move this rule forward. Mahalo nui.

Jennifer Romero: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Kahi Anahole). Your line is open.

(Kahi Anahole): Aloha, my name is (Kahi Anahole). I am from Kula, Maui. I'm also a homesteader in (Maia Huli).

And I'm calling because I adamantly object and strongly oppose the Department of Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing a government to government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community.

I specifically object to the part of the rules proposed that allow for the roll of Native Hawaiians to defined by the state of Hawaii. That rule is incorrect. It's hewa. The numbers that they project on that rule are inaccurate.

And I think if the U.S. Department of Interior goes back to their oral testimonies that they took from the Native Hawaiian community last year they'll see that many of us are objecting to the DOI's participation in any process that involves Native Hawaiian and government building.

Like many have said before, this is not the entity or organization that should be talking to Native Hawaiians. On that, I would like to say personally that (Robin Danner) doesn't speak for me. The SCHAA doesn't speak for me.

And in fact, nobody has asked me if they could speak for me, but in fact, both Washington D.C. and DADAP may speak for me. So my problem with this process is that you are not speaking to the Native Hawaiian community. You are speaking to a select few and are choosing to listen to those select few.

Instead of the community that has come before you on their own, not as an organized campaign or a postcard to see how many people they can get to sign a postcard and send it in for support of this process.

I also object getting back on track to subjecting the Native Hawaiian governing entity to the U.S. Congress's plenary authority. That doesn't seem to me that that would be a government to government relationship if we are still under the control of Congress.

I strongly oppose the portion of the rule that states the reestablishment of the formal government to government relationship will not affect the title, jurisdiction, or status of federal lands and property in Hawaii. I am also concerned that no meaningful consultation is occurring on this process.

And before I end my testimony, I would like to add that I am testifying under duress. This testimony is by no means an endorsement of this process, but rather something that I felt I needed to do even though I don't believe that you have the authority to conduct this process. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. And again, just as a reminder, if you would like to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name after the prompt. Please record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Anthony Aguiar). Your line is open.

(Anthony Aguiar):Everybody is talking about trying to get off the rolls and oppose everything that is happening with DOI. I have tried several times to get off the rolls because I don't want what they want, and we have been trying for a long time.

And then also the representatives, the list of candidates they have that they say they want to represent us. No one has come and talked to me about them also. And also the other thing is that nobody's put out information about these people.

They can go ahead and get on. Who put them on? I don't know what do they stand for? I don't know. Why should I vote them? I know why because I don't know who they are or what they stand for.

So when we are voting, we don't know what we doing, so we don't vote for it. And that's what comes - that's the problem. This is something that the Danner sisters put out and the lady before, two persons before me for \$3.1 million?

Is that all going to help out the Danner sisters subjugate the people of Hawaii? I don't think so. It's not going to work out that way, because we do not want that. If this keeps on going for another hour, you will find that more of us will still be calling in.

That person that who has 50% Hawaiian and is squatting on Hawaiian lands, oh, that's great, but you know what? All of us can vote, but people who are going to benefit from it are only going to be people like you. What about my children? What about my grandchildren? What about my great grandchildren? Oh, they don't matter?

Where are you Hawaiian at? Are you (unintelligible) that you sit on, or are you Hawaiian in your heart? I don't know which one it is that you favor the

most there, but it seems like it's a part of the body that's picked on. I do not have or do as that way.

I help out as many people as I can. You don't want to help out anybody. So with that said, I will leave it to the next speaker, and again, I oppose any relationship with the federal government, and I oppose (Robin Danner). Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. And our next comment comes from (Pohai Ryan). Your line is open.

(Pohai Ryan): Aloha. Thank you for your patience. I do want to share something with the previous callers and those on the call. As a former senator representing Waimanalo, I was very proud of the way they handled their DOI community meetings.

The majority of the people in the room actually opposed the relationship, but the way they handled it was respectful and worthy of what sovereign individuals should be behaving themselves. Sovereign to sovereign is respectful. Even the queen would have been proud of that.

I attended three meetings and was quite disgusted with some of them, how some of the audience bullied our own people in public, which is why a lot of people started to leave and just wrote in their support and didn't want to attend any more meetings.

With that said, I think one thing that the (Makua) and some of the (kupuna) do not acknowledges the previous movements, things that we have done wrong, one of them being that we label each other.

That is why we cannot come to the same room and have decent conversation. The extreme position prevents us from having intelligent dialogue that's productive and that will move our people to a higher place.

I personally did not confirm my registration for the AHA until two days before the deadline but honestly I was tired of signing up the fourth roll. Each time I knew I was signing up to work towards a better place for our lahui. And because of that, I did confirm my registration.

We have to have trust and faith for the sake of the following generations. For their sakes, I also spoke to some young ones, please do not to repeat our mistakes. Please keep an open mind, productive dialogue. Let's go forward.

Because people keep talking about political this political that. Well guess what? I see manipulation on both sides. Both on opposition and those who support, but we have to get together and we have to move forward, no matter where it's at.

And for those who claim the majority of us do not want this, there is no proof of that. Absolutely none. And if people want off the rolls, then by all means, please do that.

I protested when they tried to make a deadline imposed quickly on the first run of Kanai'i Aupuni, because I said you cannot not be Hawaiian the day after you sign up. The deadline is imposed. We're always Hawaiian, and we should always be open.

The question about membership, there has to be a threshold. And to accept that 100% of our people will support one way or the other is unrealistic. That

is a colonized way of thinking. None of us, why should we all agree on one thing? Why should we be 100%?

No one is preventing anyone from participating in anything. We need to take responsibility and take that action on ourselves. And thank you for the time. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Charmaine Bugato). Your line is open.

(Charmaine Bugato): Aloha mai. My name is (Charmaine Bugato). I am a resident of Puna Ewa on the big island of Hawaii. And as a Hawaiian National of the Kingdom of Hawaii, I live under the military occupation of the United States. And I vehemently am opposed to the DOI proposed rule being discussed today.

Since the military occupation of the United States and the Kingdom of Hawaii during the Spanish American war, America has made its presence an overpowering force upon the Kingdom subjects in relation to our land and resources.

The U.S. establishment of military occupation within another country, my country, the Kingdom of Hawaii, negates the DOI's authority to propose such rules outside of its jurisdiction, which is limited to the American land base, and therefore it cannot be fulfilled within my country.

So America may begin to deoccupy immediately. As we have heard before, Queen Liliuokalani never relinquished the sovereignty of the Kingdom of Hawaii. She only relinquished her executive powers to the President's executive position of the United States at that time.

As a result, the president of the United States gave an apology to us its nation, that our Hawaiian nation in 1993. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the U.S. to militarily de-occupy the Kingdom of Hawaii immediately. Kue. Aloha aina, you guys. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Pele Leloi). Your line is open.

(Pele Leloi): I support the rules and feel that it's important that we go forth with whatever it takes to have these rules implemented. Also my sister, (Marilyn), who's sitting with me now, also supports this, so can you just confirm that, (Marilyn)?

(Marilyn): Yes I do.

(Pele Leloi): Okay, thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Dre Kalili). Your line is open.

(Dre Kalili): Aloha. I want to just provide brief oral comments, and I will follow them up with greater detailed written comments, but I do strongly support the rule. I ask and urge of the Secretary of the Interior to adopt the rule.

It's generally a good rule. I would echo a concern raised by a previous speaker that time certain for the Secretary to ask once a petition is submitted would be an amendment that I would absolutely support being included in the rule.

But generally speaking, like I said, it is a good rule. It provides an option that is not already available to Native Hawaiians. It is an option that does not preclude any other expression of inherent sovereignty.

And I think most important, the rule in the preamble language says very clearly by underscoring language that was in the apology resolution that acknowledges that upon annexation, Hawaii without the consent or compensation to our community, the indigenous people.

We were denied a mechanism for expression of our inherent sovereignty through self-government and self-determination, and this rule creates an opportunity that we do not already have that will enable us and empower us to be self-governing, to be self-determining.

And to express our inherent sovereignty. And for that reason, I absolutely support the rule, and again ask the Secretary of the Interior to adopt the proposal. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next comment comes from (Kalamakayno Nehu), and if you would like to ask or make a comment please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling.

(Kalamakayno Nehu): You know, again reiterating my opposed opposition to the proposed rule. I'm bringing testimony that I collected from a variety of people that we are working with. So far we have organized about five different community meetings. All of these meetings have an (unintelligible) approximately 100 people.

Of those people, a significant amount are there stating that they don't have enough information about what Na'i Aupuni is, but the vast majority at our meetings in the recent months have stated opposition to federal recognition as well as the proposed DOI rules.

In regards to the numbers, the reason why there's illegitimacy of the numbers in the particularly Nai Aupuni roll perfectly exemplifies an earlier testimony that stated that 5,000 people who participated in the DOI testimonies last year show this process was with the consent of our people.

That's a perfect example of how numbers are being utilized and being not ethically turned into stating support for this process. So that's the majority of people that testified.

And this is all a matter of public record. And I'm not just talking about public record that is controlled by the DOI. These videos are distributed broadly through Olelo and through a variety of independent video productions.

I'd also like to address the previous comment regarding not enough time has occurred. We are in order to provide an adequate education, they're saying that because during our community hearings, during our community meetings and educational circuits, people are telling us that they don't know what's going on.

50% of members under my name under my last name that are listed under the Kanaiolowalu and the Nai Aupuni lists are on there against circumstance.

All of them tried to withdraw their names five times, maybe six times and they were never removed. Of the other, other proportion of my family about maybe about 30% don't even know that they are even on the list.

They were, I called them up directly and advised them of this. So according to my family which is a very large family, we had, when I was a child, we had about a family unit of about 5,000 people on the island of Hawaii.

Out of my family that means that 75% of them are on that list either without their consent or without their knowledge. Mahalo. I thank you and I'm done for my comments at this time.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. And if you would like to ask, make a comment over the phone, please press star 1. And we do have a comment from (Kalana Fraiser). Your line is open.

(Kalana Fraiser): Good morning. I strongly oppose The Department of the Interior's proposal to create an administrative procedure for reestablishing a government to government relationship with the Hawaiian community.

I specifically object to those portions of the proposed rule that would allow a roll of native Hawaiian certified by a State of Hawaii commission like Kana'ioloowalu that is being brought, that is being used by Na'i Aupuni to determine participation when the admitted 62% of the approximate 123,000.

Or 76,000 names on the role came from different OHA lists and registries without the free, prior, and informed consent of those who signed on to those prior lists and registries including one registry that was used to qualify for OHA programs such as loans and grants and scholarships. I oppose this because I was recruited to get signatures on the island of Kauai against the Akaka Bill.

I went and got 500 signatures on the petition and those petition names were used on the Kana'ioloowalu list against the will of the people who signed the list and they made absolutely no attempt to remove the names.

Even though I called, they told me they felt they were within their legal right to use those names. Even though I told them that those names signed anti-

federal recognition petitions. I heard this happened with another 19,500 people as well.

I strongly opposed the portion of the rule that states that the reestablishment of a formal government to government relationship will not affect title, jurisdiction, or status of federal lands and properties in Hawaii which amounts to 898,637 acres in the main Hawaiian home, Hawaiian Islands. And over 88,000,000 million acres of the Marine National Monument.

The proposed rule does not include any land except for possibly for Kahoolawe because state law currently provides the state shall transfer management and control of the island and its waters to sovereign native Hawaiian entity upon its recognition by The United States of Hawaii.

I object to subjecting the native Hawaiian governing entities to congresses plenary authority. The proposed rule does not provide for any compensation of any past wrongs to the family of the Kamehameha's whose grand aunt was victim of a terrorist act by the United States to which they stole all of the lands and the inheritance of the entire Kamehameha family.

There must be, must be the return of all the crown lands to the crown and the family of the Kamehamehas to whom they belong. I am concerned that there is no meaningful consultation is occurring on this process throughout Hawaii.

While The Department of Interior issued an advance notice to propose rule making and held public meetings last year for responses to specific quick questions. No meetings have been scheduled to explain the proposed rule and discuss its implications.

The only meetings are by teleconference to receive public comments. And when I try to comment on the one last, three days ago, I heard some completely uninformed Indians, American Indian tribal leader saying that she supported the proposed rulemaking and this entire process. They have nothing to say about our Hawaiian affairs.

Instead the federal government should focus on fulfilling the trust responsibilities they are utterly failing right now such as instituting a breach of trust suit as provided in Section 5f of the Admissions Act. And I reserve the right to supplement my comment in writing. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Our next comment comes from (Michelle Kauhane) your line is open.

(Michelle Kauhane): Aloha mai kakou. Mahalo for the opportunity to testify. My name is (Michelle Kauhane) I'm a homesteader from (Kauai Tia) on Hawaii homelands in (Kapolei). I'm calling in today because I strongly support the federal rules proposed by The Department of the Interior to reestablish a government to government relationship with native Hawaiians.

I also understand your need to consult with other native communities across the country as you have a trust responsibility to those native people as well. I support the rule strongly particularly because it is about time that native Hawaiians are afforded parity with their native people from the U.S.

And I also want to echo the comment made earlier that one thing that I would like to see changed as the rules are proposed is that there is a definite timeline with which the secretary must respond so that we don't have this process pending forever.

I'm also absolutely clear that the federal government, The Department of Interior has nothing to do with the Na'i Aupuni process. That the federal government's role is to recognize a government that is stood up by Hawaiians, for Hawaiians and that that would be our own responsibility.

And that what the federal government is offering is a process that we go through should we want our government to be recognized by your government. So again I thank you for the opportunity. I agree with the comments of (Dre Kalili) and that this is a well written rule.

The preamble answers many of the questions that were brought up in your ANPRM meetings here in Hawaii. And again we mahalo you for the efforts of the Obama Administration in bringing parity to the native Hawaiian people.

Coordinator: Again if you would like to make a comment please press star 1. The next comment comes from (Noah Emmitt Aloii) your line is open.

(Noah Emmitt Aloii): Aloha mail kakou. My name is (Noah Emmitt Aloii), I'm a family physician in private practice on the island of Molokai. The health and well-being our native Hawaiian community has been the driving force of my 40 year career in medicine. Health is beyond physical extending to the well-being of our community, our aina and our nation.

And as a founding member of the Protect Kahoolawe Ohana I want to support all pathways to sovereignty it will not block any pathway. The federal pathway for sovereignty is important to open and to fulfill the terms of state law.

And have Kahoolawe be transferred to a Hawaiian governing entity recognized by the state and federal government, the first lands of our nation.

I support the DOI rule as the rule acknowledging the input received from the native Hawaiian community. A critical mass of more than 1000 native Hawaiians. It opens a pathway which allows the native Hawaiian government to seek government to government relationships with its federal government.

It provides a pathway for native Hawaiian government to seek a government to government relationship with the federal government that will protect laws benefiting native Hawaiians from race based litigation.

Such as the Native Hawaiian Health Act, the federal funding of (unintelligible) of Native Hawaiians, Native Hawaiian Language Act, Native Hawaiian or the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and also the Native American Graves Protection and Recreation Act. Federal laws our generation accomplished while protesting and working the system.

It offers a pathway for government to government relationship with the U.S. government that will protect State trusts from native Hawaiians for native Hawaiians with a race based litigation.

The Department of Hawaiian Homelands and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. It will protect the Alii trusts from race based litigation. Since Rice v. Cayetano there have been four cases against DHHL and or OHA and three cases against Kamehameha schools. It will protect state laws from race based litigation.

Hawaiian as an official language of Hawaii, native Hawaiians as beneficiaries to receive Public Lands Trusts, protection of tradition of customary rights of native Hawaiians (unintelligible), cultural and religious purposes and water rights. Hawaiian studied this at DOE and the university including our kupuna in the schools program.

I carry a legacy the first hearing regarding statehood was held in Hawaii in 1935 by the U.S. House Committee on the territory. There were 150 persons who testified. Ninety were in favor and 60 opposed to statehood.

One of those who testified, 17 were native Hawaiians and 15 testified in favor. One opposed, and one offered additional support. That was my grandfather Attorney (Noah Westfield Luis) who had drafted and lobbied for the original Hawaiian Ruler's Commission Act.

And stated that he would only support statehood if the welfare, wellbeing and non-extinction of native Hawaiians would be protected. He urged the congressmen to include native Hawaiians under the Wheeler Howard Act.

Or the Indian Recognition Act which had passed the year before. I wondered in my deliberations if we would be better off now to trust in the generation to come to push forward. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Again, if you would like to make a comment, please press star 1. The next comment comes from (Jacob Brian Aki) your line is open.

(Jacob Brian Aki): Aloha mai kakou. I just want to say thank you for this opportunity to voice our opinions on this matter. I want to say that I strongly support the ruling that The Department of Interior has put forth.

You know I agree that this rule would reaffirm that native Hawaiians are a political community that has a special legal and political status such reaffirmations would strengthen protections against legal threats to programs and impediments that benefit our people.

I feel that this rule is fair, and I feel that you know, as a people we have to move forward with this opportunity. I just want to thank The Department of Interior and the Obama Administration for providing this opportunity.

And I want to reaffirm that those commenting that this is an opportunity to voice your concerns on The Department of Interior ruling and that it should be such and not any other concerns. Thank you.

Coordinator: Again if you would like to make a comment please press star 1. The next from (Cornelius Luciano) your line is open.

(Cornelius Luciano): Aloha. My name is (Cornelius Likwills Kahali Anali Auii Luciano). And I am not in favor of any of these processes. The DOI has no right to intervene in the processes of a government to government relationship.

Because if the government that occupies us the United States, the occupier, they should have been following the rules from the beginning. Then there wouldn't be no problem with the government to government relationship. No other people have the right to say anything about us kanaka maoli. That is all I have to say. Mahalo.

Coordinator: The next comment comes from (Rosanna Allegato). Your line is open.

(Rosanna Allegato): Aloha, my name is (Rosanna Anoneni Allegato) and I'm calling to support the DOI rule which provides a process for the native Hawaiian government to reestablish government to government relationships with the United States of America.

One of the most important things I think about this process is that this rule acknowledges input from the community and takes into account many of the

concerns. My personal concern, and the reason why I'm in support of this rule is because I think it's extremely important for us to protect the laws both federal and state, the ones that benefit native Hawaiians.

And it is important to protect them from any litigation based on racial discrimination because it is inaccurate because native Hawaiian people are in fact a political entity. Moreover, I think it's extremely important because this will provide a way or a process by which we can protect our native Hawaiian trusts.

My one question is about how we can then go about setting up a process by which we can reclaim or put in claims to native Hawaiian lands. That is it. And so I am in support of the DOI rulings. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Again, if you'd like to make a comment, please press star 1. At this time there are no further comments. Our next comment comes from (Michelan Trainor). Your line is open.

(Michelan Trainor): Mahalo nui loa. I would just like - I want to know why in the DOI rules it states that all of our programs, all of our funds, even the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act and the HHLRA, they are already - were already recognized and they will always be, they will be protected.

And so if native Hawaiians are already protected and already in a special trust relationship with the United States, and all of our programs are already protected as it states in the DOI rules, why then would we need to go to a further step to seek federal recognition.

I do want native Hawaiians to have their own governing entity, but I would want it to come from the people and include all of the people, not just people who are interested in federal recognition.

And this is my main reason for opposing the DOI rules. Because these rules will in effect take away the right of native Hawaiians from ever litigating against the state and against the federal government.

And so the question for me is for - and for all of those people that have said that they want the programs protected. I mean, why do we want federal recognition when our programs are already protected? Thank you for allowing me to make this comment.

Coordinator: The next comment comes from (Charlene Kasner). Your line is open.

(Charlene Kasner): Aloha mai kakou. My name is (Charlene Pehomoni Kasner). I am a Kanaka Maoli born on the island of Maui, raised on Oahu and now residing in Garden Grove, California. I strongly support the Department of Interior ruling. Let us not forget the 150 federal statutes we were afforded by the U.S. government over the last century.

This is a way for us to strengthen what we already have and an opportunity to gain more. This is a pathway to protect laws benefiting native Hawaiians and state trusts and Alii trusts for native Hawaiians, and is the best pathway for health and education for all native Hawaiians.

Not only in the state of Hawaii but also for those of us residing on the continental United States and Alaska. Let us move this forward. Mahalo nui loa to the Department of Interior and to all of you on the line. Mahalo.

Coordinator: The next comment comes from (Kalimo Kaimi Nahu). Your line is open.

(Kalimo Kaimi Nahu): Aloha, this is (Kalimo Kaimi Nahu). I'm calling in regarding as far as seems like several of our people are having a challenge accessing the teleconference, so I would like to add on some of the testimony that they're saying currently right now online.

One of the things is the comments that we are having is that in regards to not being enough time to decide upon what's happening here. That is certainly the case for some of our people, but I think that people have also made very clear that they have enough time.

They haven't had enough time at this point to not trust the people who are running the Na'i Aupuni election process. The rolls that we have been going through, the variety of different community meetings that we have been a part of have been demonstrated that a lot of our people are not on the roll specifically because they do not put faith in the Na'i Aupuni process.

Now if we can be allowed to create a situation and we have third party oversight, particularly we would desire that to occur through the United Nations to be a part of a process to seeking toward our independence.

We believe that is the best course possible forward. Now right now the DOI is currently overseeing this process. That is like asking the people who are benefiting from the U.S. and (unintelligible) into their structure to oversee the process of justifying whether or not we are going to belong to their structure.

Throughout the world the United Nations has identified several instances where nations are recreated under changing political times. This is an international standard that other - that has been established.

The United Nations has monitors but they also have our media, our propaganda, our education informational dissemination process. There are definitely standards that are in place that will oversee and ensure that this is a just and equitable process.

Currently Na'i Aupuni has no oversight whatsoever in order to prove that they are actually representative of the people. The only people that they have certifying is for the State of Hawaii who has a vested financial interest in ending any future legal claims, any disputations over land rights, water rights, and Hawaiian rights.

They also have a vested interest in claims, in perpetuating the funding that's coming through the United States. OHA is also a state agency and has a financial - a financial vested interest in maintaining that relationship.

All of the language that is currently being spoken for currently is for the people who currently have the resources to maintain their resources. So again, yes. The one thing that I do agree with is statement.

In as far as pro federal recognition and pro DOI is that yes, enough time has passed, and yes our people have spoken. Our people have spoken that 90, 80% of our people do not trust this process. They do not believe in this process and they do not consent to this process. Mahalo nui.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Our next comment comes from (Mikael Amiglia). Your line is open.

(Mikael Amiglia): Aloha, my name is (Mikael Amiglia). I just want to sum up. I feel like with it being recorded just for the DOI to listen to later or we're teleconferencing with each other.

If we want to interact and not be talk radio, I mean as in like we should talk to each other and we're not going to, if nobody else is speaking back. This is like another sad example of the, whatever potential proposal interaction that DOI's trying to make again.

My question to anyone listening is what are we really doing here? As individuals, we can talk to each other, but we need to choose a side and take action if you support, show you are supporting your community.

By teaching anyway, you can. Being part of community. For example, I go and teach a little Hawaii at a youth center and also specializing cultural restoration. We need to be an example period, to each other.

Just bring that up as a topic of teleconferencing. Also, I only heard from like four candidates from Na'i Aupuni. I mean I did want to hear from some more candidates especially inter Island.

Just wondering what happened there. And last point, Na'i Aupuni is - does come into play. How we going to protect our sustainability? I mean that's what I mean, focus. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. We have no further comments over the phone at this time. If you would like to get in queue, please press star 1, and record your name with the spelling. And we have a comment from (Joseph Henderson). Your line is open.

(Joseph Henderson): Boo Ka Na'i Aupuni. Stop trying to make a government for us. It's our own. Our choice to make our own government and I don't agree with the new opposed rules that Ka Nai Aupuni are coming up and trying to make.

And I don't agree with anything that comes from the fake State of Hawaii. You can't even show a (unintelligible) which means you're only here on subsequent duration and need to get out of our government and leave us alone.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. Our next comment comes from (Kenneth Carberel). Your line is open.

(Kenneth Carberel): Hello. Hello.

Coordinator: Your line is open.

(Kenneth Carberel): Okay I'm a Hawaiian National, and it's pretty much the United States has destroyed our country. All they're doing is pillaging us. We are subjected to a Roman form of government with Legislators, Senators, Governors, and that's not how the Hawaiian people lived.

The Hawaiian people lived under common law. We don't have - we are just pillaged every day. We don't pay taxes. All paychecks are jacked. Hijacked 1/3 and the federal government they take money out of our paychecks.

And it's real hard to understand that the federal government is - does not recognize us. But why are they taking money out of our paychecks? That's what we want. We're tired of them pillaging.

The Department of Interior they're all liars. The Congress is liars. The United States is not a country to trust, and I absolutely feel that they are evil. Evil upon the whole world with all their war-making machines and everything.

They take the money out of our pockets to provide for their wars. So and this Roman Civil Government, the State of Hawaii, needs to get out of here because they have committed heavily desecration.

And the only way to get rid of desecration is to get rid of occupation. So we wish the United States would just take the State of Hawaii and get out of here with all the fraud, lies. The court system is fake.

Everything is fake because there's no treaty that was signed. No treaty, no law, no land. And the Hawaiian Kingdom has always existed. Because it was all fake. That's all.

So the Hawaiian Kingdom is here. We have our Kingdom. We have our Kamehameha line of people that are ready to go into becoming a Monarchy. So that would be the best form of government for us right now.

And we just want the State of Hawaii to pack up, get out. So we can have our import-exports, duties, and tariffs. So our country can exist as every other country in the world.

We're tired of being so-called people without a country because of United States thinks we're - you know, we're not U.S. Citizens. There was a judicial memo out there 15 years ago that pretty much exposed all of the wrongdoings by the federal government and Department of Interior.

They come down here. We want you guys to stop trying to manage us already because our government is still in place. Our constitution is still in place. And the people are embracing it right now as I speak.

The more and more people are turning away from the United States because we're just tired of them pillaging us, generation after generation. They come here like I said, they hijack our paychecks. One-third of our money they take out for the federal government.

Why doesn't the federal government return that money to us? So that way they know. Because we're not federally recognized. We shouldn't be paying jack. But the United States came here, destroyed our monetary system, destroyed our source of commerce.

So that we can no longer have import-export, duties and tariffs. So our country can exist as a country is and always was. So this is our land for Hawaii (Pai aina), and we just need to get rid of this State of Hawaii. We wanted it out. If the Department of Interior can do anything about it...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Amai Ahoo). Your line is open.

(Amai Ahoo): Aloha. My comment is I support nation-to-nation recognition. I think it's the fastest, most effective way to get some justice for Hawaiian people and empower us. It will eliminate the race-based lawsuits. Give power to the trust like Oahu especially at the state, DHHL and protect them. And I think that is our best chance forward. Thank you for your time. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. And we have no further comments on the phone at this time. If you would like to get in queue, please press star 1, and record

your name with the spelling. And we have a comment from (Rait Envirus).  
Your line is open.

(Rait Envirus): Aloha. My name is (Rait Envirus), and I strongly support the Department of Interior's rule to establish a path for a future native Hawaiian government to be recognized by the United States.

These rules are the native Hawaii communities latest and best shot to pursue a path toward federal recognition should we decide to later on. This rule will simply allow us the option to pursue recognition.

Let's give ourselves and future generations that opportunity at this very opportune time while we have a very supportive president in the White House. I personally support federal recognition of a native Hawaiian government.

Having this special political status is important for many reasons. As a community, we've been pursuing recognition for over 15 years. From my personal standpoint, this is nearly half my life.

I wouldn't want us to be in the same position for the next 15 years. We'll be doing a disservice to younger and future generations if that ends up being the case. I would only want them to be reaping the benefits that come along with recognition. Let's take advantage of this opportunity while it's in front of us now. Thank you for listening. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathburn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Aloha. My name is (Thomas Rathburn), and I reside in the Kingdom of Hawaii. I'm in Hawaii in the Puna area. I'm 55 years old, and I strongly

oppose the Department of Interior process to begin a process to have federal recognition of native Hawaiians - we're not native Hawaiians.

We're Hawaiian King Subjects of the Kingdom Hawaii. I feel that it is very uninformed for parties to promote this idea because if they're impatient for some benefit that they seek for themselves or others or in the future that does not supersede the fact that this process will actually eliminate the very benefits that we are - we own as a sovereign king subjects of Hawaiian Kingdom.

So we need full restoration like Kingdom not a subjugated federal recognition by United States government. United States has no treaties of annexation. Before we should move forward on any process to determine whether native Hawaiian subjects and Kanaka Maoli or the people of the Hawaiian - Polynesian race that reside in Hawaii originally.

Before we should move for any process to work a DOI or the Nai Aupuni conglomerates. This is not the judged by themselves this is not a plebiscite its not an election. This simply like a private group. It's like a condo association passing rules.

How can that be a legitimate process for the people who they're attending to assess which are the Hawaiian king subjects in all those things attached to all those people attached to all the future generations and the past history of fraud and belligerent occupation by United States here in Hawaii?

My father is three war veteran. I'm not anti-American. We're not against America. We are not against anybody. We are for Hawaii. We are for our incentives, our freedoms, for trade, for commerce, for health, wellbeing and the welfare of the nation of Hawaii and control of the land of our country which are clearly separated from the United States by the Pacific Ocean.

By thousands of miles, 22,550 nautical miles to a point where California is the closest continental point in (unintelligible) in the world. So we don't need a belligerent occupation to continue.

What we need is to preserve our right under international law which would allow for us whenever the time is right, whenever that may come, today, tomorrow, next year, 100 years, then we can move forward in the proper, lawful way to restore our Kingdom and create a governing body of our choice.

Not this diminished, subjugated, relationship as a native Hawaiian within the United States of America's domain with plenary powers of congress over our destiny. They could if those who's seeking instead of recognition.

They have to understand that the sovereignty that we enjoy now is an inherent, a true sovereignty and also enjoy the sovereignty of the Hawaiian kingdom which is being smothered, handicapped, kidnapped by the United States Government.

So their sovereignty does not to supersede ours but you see there's illegal, unlawful history that continues until they release us from their illegitimate grasp so we can function and take care of ourselves.

We don't need the Jones Act. We can open trade. We can have a wonderful economy. The last time that anybody invaded the Kingdom of Tonga or, you know, Western Samoa, I don't know.

It's not happening. This is a different world that we're living in now. And we're not worrying about China invading Hawaii. Okay, the United States is worried about China. The United States is worried about a lot of things.

Hawaiians are not worried about that. We are neutral, independent nation, state. Okay, we need to rectify that all this bologna, all this clatter of layer after layer of lies, deceit, and fraud. And just get it straight. So we can be good friends again.

And we can maintain our treaties. Or reestablish a relationship with the United States. A healthy relationship for all concerned. For all the world. For America, Hawaii and everybody else. It's a positive thing that would be good for America as well. They need this right now. They need to restore this to its proper status.

Coordinator: Thank you for comments. Your time is up. Next we have (Kai Poaka). Your line is open.

(Kai Poaka): Aloha mai kakou. ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:13:17 - 0:13:43)). Please, everybody, my name is (Kai Poaka). ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:13:47 - 0:13:48)). I'm fourth generation (Konahiki). Low ranking chief and we still have 100.65 acres that's been signed by Kamehameha III to my great-great-grandfather and my dad still has the Kingdom deeds.

So with all of this, we don't have land. We do have land. It's still backed by Kingdom law. That does not get recognized by the state and the local court system because this is over international issue regarding law. What's right?

My aina's at stake. (My Ohana) is at stake. A lot of Hawaiians who's been shunned from this truth that the families still do have land. They still do have the right to access water.

They still do have the right to control their natural resources. Land, sea, the sky, the sky borders, the land borders, the sea borders. All of these are getting leased out illegally by the State.

The de facto state of Hawaii. This Na'i Aupuni process is not anything different from what we've witnessed the illegal overthrow by the Big Five sugarcane plantation owners.

Your missionary this is to have this process last this long and our people, majority of our people in the homestead where the Department of Interior came to Hawaii and visited all the islands.

Everybody from Little Keiki's which is our future generation to our Kupunas that lived through the onslaught of the culture being deprived from them, discriminated, segregated.

This is what's at stake. Is our land. They see land and assets. All they see is money. We need our people to return back to the land without these private property signs and no trespassing signs.

We need to farm the land. These delegates in Na'i Aupuni how much of them farm the land? These delegates that you're going to have - need my people, my family, how much of them know the stories of every single family on the traditions that went on, on their land? They don't.

They work with the state. It's identity theft. They basically took all the names from the roll commission, and they're using it as a private organization. There's nothing different between being...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Collin Tuoua Willis). Your line is open.

(Collin Kekoa Willis): Aloha. My name is (Collin Kekoa Willis) I just want to come on to say I don't agree with the DOI process and Nai Aupuni. I believe that if the United States was serious about working with indigenous people of Hawaii, that we should be given the Secretary of State, not the DOI.

We know that the DOI is interested in our natural resources and the privatization of that. But what we want is independence and freedom and self-determined for ourselves. Thank you. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. Our next comment comes from (Lileen McGregor). Your line is open.

(Lileen McGregor): Aloha. (Lileen McGregor) ((Foreign Language Spoken 02.40 - 02)). I'm calling in strong support of the proposed of DOI rules. I support it because I worked on Capitol Hill for 15 years of which 7 were on the Select committee for Indian Affairs when Senator Danny Inouye was chairman of the committee.

And my job was developing legislation for native Hawaiians. During this time, we passed the Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Program. We passed Native Hawaiian Health Act.

We passed the Native Hawaiian Education Act. We passed the Native Languages Act. NAGPRA was enacted and as a result of these programs which some of them we had been receiving federal funds from before, our people have been receiving funding for Nanaleo has much-needed development for Hawaiian language curriculum.

We were the first native people to bring our (Evey) home. Our (Evey Kupuna) home from the Smithsonian Institution as a result of these acts. Scholarship money has contributed to more native Hawaiians being able to attend college. Our socio-economic statistics have improved as a result of this federal money flowing into our communities.

And we are threatened by not gaining federal recognition because if we are challenged as these laws being race-based, the chances are we will lose the way the past cases have gone in favor of for example (Rice Cayetano) where (Rice) was successful in eliminating native Hawaiian's only for voting for (OHA).

And everybody gets to vote. This is a risk we run if we do not achieve federal recognition and ability to form our own government-to-government relationship with the federal government. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. Our next comment comes from (Shandel Haway Essengen). Your line is open.

(Shandel Haway Essengen): ((Foreign Language Spoken 04:36). This is (Shandel Haway Essengen), and I would like to talk about the U.S. government proposed government-to-government deal. It's important to recognize that the Kingdom of Hawaii is a nation and should be recognized as such.

If the United States wants to reestablish a relationship, it should be nation-to-nation relationship. And not a government-to-government relationship. I also want to acknowledge that while 5% of our people - 5.5% of our people have called in, have signed on, and have asked to engage in this process.

What's more important is to acknowledge that 94.5% of all Kanaka Maoli of original Hawaiian have clearly spoken that they do not agree to this process. They have not voluntarily signed onto this process.

Their voices should be heard. And I'm going to say it again 94.5% of the population of adults living in the United States which is 707,000 people, 94.5% of those people have said no.

And they have said no by omission. You do not have an option on the ballot that allows their voices to be heard. So I am putting it on record that those people who have not participated, who have not signed on, are the majority, and they have said no. I, they, we, remain our inherent sovereignty. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. Our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathburn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Aloha. Hi yes, I just want to say under the Department Interior due to restrictions of the United States federal government, the inherent sovereignty that people, in my opinion, inherent sovereignty for discussing under this demand of the United States is not the same as the concept of inherent sovereignty which is innate, born in.

I mean it's something that can't be taken away. I agreed with this concept. But full sovereignty state sovereignty international sovereignty can't probably come and go depending on circumstances, war and seizures and all sorts of things can happen in history.

But inherent sovereignty is something that can't be taken away. However, the concept of inherent sovereignty as is applied under the United States laws

pertaining to Native American tribes and nations is a completely different thing.

I don't know of any nation or tribe within the country or territories of United States of America that have recognition or not that includes inherent sovereignty supersedes that of the plenary powers of congress.

So if people are promoting this concept that we're going to maintain or achieve some level of inherent sovereignty through this dispute with Department of Interiors process, this is a really not true and people need to understand that.

Further, the State of Hawaii, which is not, has no true sovereignty. Otherwise the State of Hawaii would probably have created their own constitution, their own flag, and their own anthem.

However, the fact remains that the United - excuse me the State of Hawaii, their constitution is their last active - living constitution of the Kingdom of Hawaii. Now, whether Hawaiian subjects agree with that constitution or not because of the history behind some of these constitutions and things that took place, there's a question there.

However, it was a valid constitution. It was active during the Kingdom and was adopted by the State of Hawaii along with the Kingdom - one of the Kingdom flags and the Kingdom National Anthem, Hawaii Pono.

And so the concept or the idea that Na'i Aupuni should get millions of dollars of Hawaiian assets or should I say Hawaiian Kingdom subjects assets whether their (kanaka maoli) or of foreign origin if their fall into the jurisdiction of a Kingdom subject.

We were not a racist nation. We accepted subjects from many different parts of the world. So the point being, we have a constitution. Why would anybody spend millions of dollars to defraud United States citizens who do not really know what's going on and to harm the Hawaiian Kingdom subjects?

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. At this time if you'd like to ask, make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Thank you. And again to make a comment, please press star 1. We have a comment from (Trinet Percado). Your line is open.

(Trinet Percado): Mahola nui. I'm calling because just as I opposed it then when the DOI came here to Maui to our public talks, I am opposing it now. I opposed establishing a government-to-government relationship through the DOI because I don't believe the DOI has the authority to do so.

I don't like the fact that establishing this government-to-government relationships would allow them to take into account Na'i Aupuni outcome should there be one as a legitimate outcome and thereby use that as our group.

And then subjecting that group to congress' plenary authority. I think that absolutely negates and doesn't even take into account that fact that Hawaii is still a sovereign nation illegally overthrown and overtaken by the United States.

And that needs to be addressed. Because we're not looking at a government within a government relationship as someone stated before we need to look at a nation-to-nation relationship, and we can't do that through this ruling.

Now I also am very concerned about the fact that it doesn't provide the compensation of past wrongs and the only time that the DOI has come back to have a "conversation" with us is within this teleconference, not since the meetings that they held last year until this time have we heard any information about it.

Have we been given any chance to be included and collaborated with within this process and I feel to just rush it for me is the United States trying to tie up some loose ends so that nothing can be done in the international arena.

And that right there is a huge concern. Because it is not taking into account that thousands of Kanaka Maoli who have passed to sign on to a Kue petition and who continue to sign off to the Kue petitions today.

To absolutely stand against what happened back then. Now we can say oh it happened then and well you can't do anything about it, but yes we can. We will, and we are. And I oppose this, and I also want to say that I do reserve the right to supplement these comments here with comments in writing. I thank you for your time.

Coordinator: Thank you for comments and our next comment comes from (Michelan Trainor). Your line is open.

(Michelan Trainor): Mahalo again. Thank you for hearing me again. I just wanted to re-endorse my opposition to the proposed rules. And again the process that has brought us to this point in time where these proposed rules were developed was the whole process that was leading towards federal recognition.

And again this is not re-establishing a form of government-to-government relationships. This process what we really need is re-establishing the nation-to-nation relationship.

Because the Hawaiian Kingdom does still exist by your own admission in the 1993 apology law. And the fact that the rules are taking away the right of native Hawaiian's simply by putting them on the same playing field as the relationship that Native American Indian tribes are in.

And that limits our litigation, powers that we cannot seek redress and also that the rules say that all of these things that are protecting now will continue to be protected.

Why would we need a formal government-to-government relationship under the DOI rules? What we really need is a nation-to-nation relationship and that we need America to de-occupy our country because the Hawaiian Kingdom still exists.

We still have our constitution, and we still have a body of people that supports it and are nationalists. And our land still exists. We still have all of these things. It's just that we are just being ruled by an occupying power under military threat. And so this is why I completely oppose the deal I proposed to. Mahalo.

Coordinator: Thank you for comment. And our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathburn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Aloha. Thank you for hearing me again as well. This is (Thomas Rathburn) from local (Kieves) out of Hawaii in the Kingdom of Hawaii. I reside in the Puna district southeast side of the island.

I was born in Berlin, Germany, January 26, 1960. They were building the wall when I was there, and they completed it while I was there. My father was in the military, three war veteran.

You know, Hawaii is a sovereign nation. United States is a sovereign nation. The only difference is between us right now is that the United States is imposing their military dominion over us.

They're controlling us with military might, economic sanctions with fraudulent government practices and institutions and entities, they are not honoring our relationship as it should be. We should be on equal status. We were the first non-European power to be recognized internationally by the world.

We recognized Japan's sovereignty before anybody else. We were the first country in history to be seized unlawfully by another country and whose sovereignty was damaged by another country, a belligerent invasion.

Contrary to history, it was not Luxembourg that was invaded by (unintelligible). It was the first to be invaded by another country in the family of nations. But it was actually the United States that invaded Hawaii.

And so, the subjects of the kingdom, the insurgents who overthrew our queen, did so with the assistance of the United States. And with the government assistance as well. And this continues, okay? This saga continues. And it needs to end. I would like to also reserve my right to supplement any further comments in writing.

But I also wanted to say that, before we proceed on anything at all with this DOI process, that I think the Department of State, Secretary of State Kerry, should certainly answer the question proposed to him by the chair of OHA, as to how is it that the United States acquired Hawaii and became part of the United States.

That needs to be answered first, by a representative of the government and the State Department who deals with these issues. That needs to be clarified first. Secondly, also, because of war crimes and because of the illegal occupation of Hawaii, and because of the international law, because there are war crimes. And there (unintelligible) has been mentioned in several...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Our next comment comes from (Kaipo Hanakoi). Your line is open.

(Kaipo Hanakoi): ((Foreign Language Spoken 16:16:31) So, before I was cut off, what I was meaning to say was that I had took the initiative to talk to many tribal leaders all across the continental United States. And I came across this one tribe, the Cheyenne in Texas.

This 85 year old tribal leader told me how they were federally recognized, twice. They came up with treaties, twice. Both of them were not recognized. Both of them still stuck in the depression, in the oppression by the oppressor.

So, all you Hawaiians, I think that this is a nation within a nation that will help us. It doesn't guarantee our independence. So you guys are still going to be under dominion of the American government. So all this sacred land, monetary included, the 30 meter telescope included, that's at stake.

Why would Nai Aupuni happen to start up right when the TMT rules are being, the decision making is being done currently, right now, by the Supreme Court. Where does that stand? Now where does Na'i Aupuni stand with (Mauna Kea)?

Where were they? Where was Department of Interior? Nowhere. Only the people, only the power of the people, the voices of God, the descendants of the great chiefs and kings that ruled these lands. That took care of families. That protected our people, our kingdom.

And still is protecting our people, our kingdom, while we're getting ridiculed in 2015. And again, I say again, Department of Interior, you guys came to Hawaii. You guys know what our people told you.

Kris Sarri: Hi. This is Kris Sarri of the Department of Interior. We have about 50 minutes remaining in this phone call. Once again, I'd ask everyone to be thoughtful of others and respect time limitations.

And before calling in, again, if you've already spoken once, allow the operator to make sure that there is no other individuals on the line that haven't had an opportunity to speak the first time, in case they're just joining in the call.

So, once again, we have about 50 minutes left on this teleconference. And again, I'd just ask people, if you've already spoken more than once, to please give others an opportunity to comment. Thank you.

Coordinator: And if you would like to comment, please press star 1 and record your name, with the spelling. And we have a comment from Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa. Your line is open.

Lilikala Kame'elehiwa: Thank you very much for taking my call. I will make my comments brief. I will be following up with written testimony. My name is Lilikala Kame'elehiwa. I am a professor at the Kamaka Cool Kalonji Center for Hawaiian studies.

I am very, very much in support of the DOI rules. I think you folks have done a great job in supporting federal recognition ideas for Native Hawaiians. I believe that Native Hawaiians should be afforded federal recognition.

It's very important to protect our benefits that we have right now, with the federal government, against race-based kinds of lawsuits. But more than that, I was a long time member of ka lahui Hawaii.

And in the year 2000, we were supported unanimously by the National Congress of American Indians for Native Hawaiians to have federal recognition. We'd been waiting a long time. The time is now.

I believe that you folks have been very, very fair. I think that it's important for Hawaiians to know that if we want to be independent, and we are a minority in our own country, then we must avail ourselves of the rights that are afforded to us from your American law through federal recognition.

We must have lands that we're going to negotiate for that will be for Native Hawaiians. We must have programs that support us in education, in our language, in our culture, that are afforded to us by the American government.

We must do that before we become independent, because if we're a minority in our country and we become independent, we might lose everything or have nothing. We will not be a majority in an independent Hawaii.

So we need to have those things clearly defined ahead of time. Now all of that's going to take a while. We need to have this Nai Aupuni election to write a constitution. Then we're going to have to ratify the constitution.

We're going to have to seat a government. That government will decide if we want to go forward for federal recognition. But as a Hawaiian who is now 62 years old, worried about my grandchildren having to leave Hawaii because 48% of all Hawaiians are having to leave Hawaii in order to make a living to survive.

I want to make sure that we have all the benefits we can here in Hawaii for my grandchildren. So I thank you very much for supporting us. I'm very sorry that people disagree with that.

I think they're unclear about what actually happens in an independent nation, and that Hawaiians would have no rights whatsoever. And certainly no rights to land. So, thank you so much for your support. And I'll be sending in my written comments. Aloha.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Lawrence Hawaii).

(Lawrence Hawaii): Hello. My name's (Lawrence Hawaii). Hello everybody. I have a statement. I believe that if the United States were to honor the Constitution and treaties that were made in agreement by our country, we would not be sitting here right now. Aole, and thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Lori Halemano). Your line is open.

(Lori Halemano): ((Foreign Language Spoken 16:22:34). I just wanted to say that I strongly oppose the Department of Interior's rules. There was no treaty of annexation. That has been clear. We don't need federal recognition.

I don't believe that we need to be recognized, especially as a tribe or as Indians, for which we are not. We are kanka maoli. We are Hawaiians. We are a sovereign, independent nation.

And I'm following in the footsteps of our queen. And of my kupuna who signed the kue petition. I will stand firm in this belief, and I will carry this on to my children and my future generation.

My moopuna will also know of what our queen wanted. And what we need is, we need sustainability for our people here in Hawaii. And we need to be taking care of the land and our people.

We don't need other people dictating what is best for us and our people. We were doing fine before we became occupied here. We just need our people to come together and be in agreement and stop having all this confusion as to what we should be doing for the future.

Because we know what needs to be done for the future. We have it in our hearts. It was instilled in us by our kupuna. And we cannot be swayed by that. We need to stand pa'a. Mahalo nui.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. And again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. And our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathburn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Aloha. Mahalo again. I would just like to say that, you know, people keep talking about, we need federal recognition for this and for that, and what will happen to us, what will happen to our children? We have to leave Hawaii to work.

Okay, I've lived all over the world. My father was born, I mean, I was born in Germany. My father's Hawaiian. My mother's from a little island in the Adriatic. The war affected them greatly.

In any case, I was born in Germany. Germany was a divided country at the time. It was occupied. But the Germans have their country back. And that's how it should be here.

We weren't involved in a war. We were just illegally seized. And so it's even more reason to restore us. But, the point being, is that we have great resources and assets which are being diminished, being damaged, destroyed, poisoned.

We honor control because we don't have control over the governing of our country and our nation. Because we are being squished and smothered by the United States and their government and all their entities and involved contracts and everything else that are affecting us here.

So, you know, by right we need to be able to breathe and function as a living, breathing, functioning nation. And a governing body is not one that dictates from a foreign country to another. And so it's very clear.

And, you know, history will shed the light, as it already has. And it will continue to do so. And the longer the United States denies what is our right and what is our condition which we should be existing right now.

As long as we continue this, the United States doesn't have a problem. You know, they're struggling with their image today. You know, money's going to foreign countries to perpetuate wars.

And big contracts to Halliburton to make money, you know, \$10,000 for a screw or whatever it is, okay. We need to get this world back in order. And the people of Hawaii know how to run a country. We know how to do it.

We've been educated, not only from our kupuna and our past experience as a very progressive, one of the most progressive nations in historic times. But we also have learned from America. So we know from the good and the bad. America's good and bad.

We also know our own, and our mistakes, if any. So, we need to move forward freely, not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior. So, you know, frankly when I hear professors and experts and civic leaders talking about, well, you know, my this, that, we have to leave Hawaii to make money.

Listen. I've lived all over the world. I moved back to Hawaii. I made lots of money in California. I moved back to Hawaii. I struggled for a while. But you know what? I prefer to live at home. I don't mind. I'm here. I'm fine.

I'm taking care of my disabled wife, you know. And we're surviving. Nobody needs to leave Hawaii if they're Hawaiian. You may prefer to leave Hawaii. We may influence other (unintelligible) to leave Hawaii for better opportunities.

But you don't have to leave Hawaii. You know, people who have never left Hawaii are very proud to never have left Hawaii. And there are people who

have left who I'm very proud for what they've done. But please, do not insult and oppress us. You're only...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Again, and if you'd like to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with spelling. Our next comment comes from Owana Salazar. Your line is open.

Owana Salazar: Good day. Yes. My name is Owana Salazar, and I am going to try to make this as succinct as possible. On January 17, 1893, when the Boston war ship was in the harbor and Queen Lili'uokalani was arrested and held under house arrest and the great coup happened that absconded with what appeared to be, well, be not an overthrow but a coup.

But exactly one month after that, on February 13, just under a month, the Minister of Finance for the Kamehamehas sent in a claim, a letter of protest, to the United States Congress, which was also published in the San Francisco Chronicle, that the Kamehamehas were the owners of the crown land, and not any government lands.

The government lands were government lands, and the crown lands were the personal, private property of the Kamehamehas. And that protest has been going on from my family for the last hundred plus years.

The Minister of Finance at the time was Franklin Seaver Pratt. And, moving right along, you have to consider that from January 17, 1893, all the way through November 11, 1917, Queen Lili'uokalani had 24 plus years to really see who around her were loyal and who were not.

And there were people conducting treason, mainly the Committee of Safety, the Committee of Thirteen, who literally dethroned her, and who continued

with their treasonous activities, their acts of war, their war crimes against the sovereign, against the kingdom, and therefor against the people.

By taking of the crown lands, and so-called ceding them, and holding the Queen Lili'uokalani under house arrest, and eventually murdering my great grandfather, Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox, who by the way, was Hawaii's first delegate to Congress in 1900 to 1902.

His life was tragically ended in 1902 because he was murdered by being fed ground glass at a party at the old Alexander Young Hotel. And post that, Queen Lili'uokalani redid her last will and testament and gave a large, all of her personal property, to my grandfather and my grand aunt.

Subsequently, when...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with spelling. And there are no questions in queue at this time.

If you would like to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. We have a comment from (Brian Kahnelamelow). Your line is open.

(Brian Kahnelamelow): ((Foreign Language Spoken 16:16:16). Today is an important day. As a lineal descendant to the royal family from this part of the world, it's a struggle for years in my family. Had to go through all this whole chaos with the military taking over Hawaii. Was a tragedy.

Today is a reality that is coming back alive. And we're seeing so many disrespect reality that's happening. Lands being taken over by corporations

from the outside that actually are corporations that already are affiliated with (George Macy), (Charles Reed), Alexander & Baldwin.

Who put in place something that is now we are finding out that these lands have been taken away because we Kanakas wasn't affiliated to these laws. And now it's coming out to haunt each and every one of us.

So we're kind of, you know, in the dark. And finally we're recognizing who we are as human beings, you know. Both of my parents are pure Kanakas. And for me to stand here and defend and protect what's legally and what's rightfully to my koko.

You know, it's not a disrespect to anybody in the world. We're all human beings. But we have different species in our bodies that we protect each culture in this world. Hawaii has been ripped away, secretly.

And now today, it's all coming out in reality. Now, you know, there's more findings ahead. Like the Akaka bill and now it's not now a funny situation that is coming up.

They're all related to what the United States is confirming, that, you know, we had a government intact. Now we don't have a government. Now, I think everybody out there is confused with this whole situation, and I am.

But, I think the reality is, as a lineal descendant, now you're recognizing who your line is. It's a blood line that you come from. That birth of the (kanau) makes your education more revealing.

Because, if this was the United States that a kingdom had overthrown, the kingdom of Hawaii would be under house arrest already. You know, damages are so severe, catastrophic, that, you know, today everything is a fact.

You know, I call (unintelligible) government to government before. And we're not nothing. Now we're, kind of like, you know, in the dark here. We're not, should be, you know, working together with this reality. We have so many opinions out there that is contradicting. And, you know, I think the reality is, as a lineal descendant...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. Again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Michelan Trainer). One moment. Your line is open.

(Michelan Trainer): Great. I'm so happy to be on here again. I just wanted to thank everybody for making their comments and thank you for the DOI for opening this up.

But, here's another thing that, you know, I want to make known, is that we've only been given these opportunities by phone, to phone in these comments. And I would really appreciate it if the DOI, if you really want to know what people really think about your proposed rules, then you need to come back to Hawaii and listen to people verbally.

Because in the proposed rules, it states that you only looked at the written comments. That you didn't listen or didn't, that you don't even mention all of the verbal comments that came from the verbal testimony that came from the thousands of people across all of the islands that were against federal recognition.

And so, if you really, really are interested in making this a broad-based community support issue, which is what you put in your proposed rules, then you will come back to Hawaii. And you will hold those things again.

And you will let more people come. And you will look at the verbal testimony and all of the records that show how many people actually oppose federal recognition. And then you'll really be able to know what constitutes community-wide, broad-based support. Mahalo nui. And kue everybody. Aloha aina.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Again, to make a comment, please star 1, and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from Lilikala Kame'elehiwa. Your line is open.

Lilikala Kame'elehiwa: Hi, and thank you so much for taking my call again. I would like to comment a little bit about what some other people have said, the DOI coming to Hawaii to hear comments from the people here.

We did have a sense of testimonies given. I want you to know that there were lots of Hawaiians, like myself, who support federal recognition, who are afraid to go to those meetings (unintelligible).

It is much better for you to hold the (unintelligible) listening sessions by telephone, where people can come and say what they think, without feeling intimidated physically by the anger that was exhibited. With really, no one there to protect anyone if they had a different point of view.

So, this is a very contentious issue. It certainly is. But I think we have, also, thousands of people who've written in to say that we support federal

recognition. And we'd like to be able to express our views without fear of intimidation.

So I'd like to thank the DOI for holding these listening sessions by telephone and for not coming to Hawaii again, so that we could all be subjected to being yelled at and told that we are wrong.

Not having the chance to actually voice our concerns. There are very serious concerns about life in Hawaii. We believe federal recognition is one way that we're going to address them.

I think there are many good people in the American government and in the American nation, and in the state of Hawaii, who want to support Hawaiians and see that the wrong that was done to us is righted.

And one of those ways to right that wrong is through the process of federal recognition. So I'd like to thank you very much for holding the listening sessions by telephone. Aloha.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. And again, for those just joining, to make a comment, please press star 1 on your touchtone phone, and record your name with the spelling. And our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathurn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Aloha. Hi. Yes, (Thomas Rathburn). Thank you for hearing me again. I just wanted to say that, in addition to what everybody has previously stated, that the issue, what I just heard, of people being intimidated by having the Department of Interior come out to Hawaii to hold hearings, which I think is a great idea.

If they want to continue this process, which I don't agree with, but if they want to, then they should come in person and really afford much more time and organization into allowing the greater majority of people who will be affected to get involved, to be better educated about these things, to be able to make better decisions.

The idea that we should abstain from returning to Hawaii because of security reasons, based on the fear that Hawaiians become violent against other Hawaiians and threaten them, and all these things. I find that absurd, honestly.

Hawaiians have never, really, attacked anybody as a nation. We're the first neutral independent nation-state to become under attack by another sovereign nation, the United States, who attacked us and stole our country.

I think the Hawaiians are upset. And I think there's a very, very good reason why. And I think that the fear mongering that's been put forth by various groups of people, individuals, whatever, is, kind of, neither here nor there.

I think that an open forum, clear discussion on all parties involved, all interested parties, is a good idea before we do anything else or make any decisions. Before we have any process go into effect.

I don't agree with any of that process that you guys are doing. But regardless, I think, should you continue, it should be done at least with some relative legitimacy, with some acknowledgement of the people involved and who'd be affected.

And to have individuals or groups or associations or anybody pedal fear based on their idea that they cannot come forth in public, is ridiculous. They go to work every day, whether they're a teacher at a university in Hawaii, or

whether they are, you know, in any other capacity of functioning and operating within the country of Hawaii.

Nobody's attacking them for their political beliefs. The people of Hawaii are not that way, regardless of the image that some may like to forward to the rest of the world. This is just not the case.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. Again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Paul Etcherberry). Your line is open.

(Paul Etcherberry): Yes. I'm calling to protest this whole procedure. This Nai Aupuni amounts to nothing more than genocide. Hawaii is an occupied sovereign nation-state. Always has been. Always will be.

And this whole process is just a sham. I believe the movement should follow this procedure of starting proceedings at the International Criminal Court. And everybody involved in this event should be called up on charges of genocide, for which there is no statute of limitations.

Also, for our dear President Obama, try as he might, he is not a legitimate U.S. president. If he were born in Hawaii, he still was not born in the United States. He is an illegitimate United States president. End of comment.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Raydeen Thompson). Your line is open.

(Raydeen Thompson):Hi. Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to speak again.

This is my last comment. I did speak earlier, and I commented on the document itself, and particularly with regarding that.

I am, would like to address, all those folks listening right now. As I previously stated, I am a HHCA-eligible Native Hawaiian, and a current beneficiary. And a Native Hawaiian to the larger community.

This does not make me better nor irrespective or irresponsible or ill-feeling toward any of my family at large, which includes all of the people in Hawaii. However, to state that we are not intimidated, or that people cannot get intimidated by these meetings, I think is absurd.

No one said that we are violent people. However, I do believe we are an emotional and impassioned people. That being said, forums for this kind of discussion need to be on a numerous platform, be it online, social media or in person. Whatever it takes to reach the largest population so that you have a cross-section of commentary by all people. Really that's - as much as I would like to say, I would like to thank not just the DOI, but all of the people who have commented.

I especially am honored to have heard the comments by (Dr. Alumi), because they were quite relevant to what's going on in all respects, especially as a caregiver - a medical caregiver to take the time to comment for all of us to listen to. I greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Our next comment comes from (Kealii Lopez). Your line is open.

And no further comments queuing at this time. If you would like to make a comment, please press star 1 on your phone and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from Owana Salazar. Your line is open.

Owana Salazar: Yes, thank you. This would be the continuation, part two, of what I spoke earlier. And I want to appreciate what others said regarding this so-called fear.

The emotional part, you know, really - it's really because this is so much pressure being put on people to accept what we may not want to accept, which has been going on for over 100 years now.

My family has been involved in communicating with the United States Congress for generations since the overthrow.

My great grandmother, Princess Theresa, and my great grandfather, Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox, protested loudly and clearly and continued to communicate with presidents, with congress people, with attorneys, until the next generation came.

We passed the baton from generation to generation to generation, and now we are here, my generation is here. And our next two generations are yet to come. I mean, they're here. What I'm saying is they're going to be carrying on the torch as we have been.

We cannot and will not ever forget what has happened - the war crimes that took place against the royal descendants, the royal families. Hawaiian kingdom has royalty. Not dead. We're not all dead. We're alive. And we know what happened. We have our histories in our families.

And one of the main things, I mean there's not a whole lot of time to talk again because there's so much - and now there's pressure, but I'm not going to get off this phone without saying one more thing, and that is as a family of royal descendants, we have never been heard.

We've never - all of a sudden it's just Native Hawaiians. We get - all of us people are thrown into this one category, when there really are many lifestyles, life walks, different roles that we have earned throughout our genealogies and our lives as descendants of all the walks of life of our ancestors.

And all of a sudden it's just one group of Native Hawaiians, and never, even in the apology bill, was it ever recognized because the - it was all Alii who owned the lands, who - this is too extensive. But I believe everyone that I can hear knows this is true.

When we look at the mahele and the Land Commission Awards and the Royal Patents, it is what gives all of you Hawaiian descendants of the names of these people who were - had the Land Commission Award the right to claim them today. And it's because it came from - it came down...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. And again, to make a comment, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from (Kealii Lopez). Your line is open. Please check...

Woman: I'm using my sister's phone. I mentioned multiple times my name is (Kapua Scroll). I'm calling from (Nanakuli), and I've attended the hearings. I attended seven of the hearings from the Department of Interior held. I work for Olelo community television.

My (unintelligible) have any (unintelligible), but I attended several of those hearings, and the man from the big island obviously didn't attend the hearing. When you talk about the thoughts at those hearings weren't intimidating.

I think it was painful for many Native Hawaiians to watch the way that our people conducted themselves. Yes, we have passion. Yes, we have emotions. We all agree that the overthrow was illegal.

But to treat each other the way that happened in those in person hearings, I thank DOI for doing these conference calls. I'm not someone who likes to get up in front of the public and talk. Having the call is better.

If he didn't watch, people were shouted down. They were disrespected. They were told to go home. They resulted in name calling of DOI people who came there out of respect to hear us. And, you know, no matter the hurt and passion, that's low.

There was no (Kapu Aloha). So I wish you guys would stop throwing that around as if you actually exercised it. It didn't happen at those hearings. It didn't happen at those hearings. Maybe now we figured that out, but I say to the DOI, don't come.

But if you want to hold more conference calls for people to feel safe to talk about stuff and not be intimidated, sure. Do that. But why come to the circus? That's what it was. It was a circus - made us look like freaks. A freak show. That's what it was.

Coordinator: Thank you for your comment. And our next comment comes from (Thomas Rathburn). Your line is open.

(Thomas Rathburn): Yes, aloha. I would just like to say also that you know all this problems that people are feeling as far as like their discomfort in discussing things issues at DOI meetings or whatever.

First of all, part of the reason that we're having this problem is because you see the division in the unrest is coming from the source. You see? The Department of Interior should not be here discussing these issues.

The Department of State should be discussing some process to restore - for the restoration of our governing body. Not the department of interior. Okay? They deal with national parks. They deal with resources. They deal with Native American tribes and nations.

We're not Native Americans. We're not Native Hawaiians. We are - I was - I'm a (Kanaka Maoli) of mixed ancestry, but I am (Kanaka Maoli), like many. I was born in Germany. Not in Hawaii. Not in America. So I'm not a Native Hawaiian, because I wasn't even born here.

But I do reserve the right as a subject of the kingdom which was afforded not only to (Kanaka Maoli) of the (unintelligible) of that race of people that existed these islands before anybody else.

But also the many other brothers and sisters that came from around the world to participate in our wonderful nation and (unintelligible) nation state became Hawaii who were afforded all the rights and benefits just as soon as they could vote.

They could, you know, operate in positions of government. They could not be the sovereign, per se, or in the house of nobles, but other than that, they could

basically have any position, even the prime minister. We did not recognize slavery.

Were very open and progressive, you know, not to (unintelligible) that many already know, but, the problem with these people, myself and everybody included, while we're having these issues and these, you know, this language of not being able to communicate because of intimidation and all these things.

You know, that's clearly coming from America. That's not coming from Hawaii. And the Hawaii (unintelligible) reacting to that. They have to understand what the source of that is - truly is, is not in Hawaii.

The Hawaiian kingdom - we could have issues we could discuss (unintelligible). We could vote or not. We could bring these things up governmentally with the Constitution or a monarchy.

As far as the lands are concerned, as well, you know, no lands belong to any individual. Whether they are royal or not. The lands belong to the kingdom. The royal the sovereign (unintelligible) at the time have control of those lands. They can issue lands and use those lands.

But those lands revert back to the kingdom, regardless how many royal patent grants how many mehele awards, makes no difference. The land in perpetuity will revert back to the kingdom and to the nation for their use in the government, which is the kingdom government, will, you know, manage these lands under their jurisdiction.

And the mo'i or the sovereigns will have say as to who gets to use those lands (unintelligible) they don't really own the land any more than the lowest member of the totem...

Coordinator: Thank you for your comments. Your time is up. And again to make a comment please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling. Our next comment comes from Owana Salazar. Your line is open.

Owana Salazar: Perfect, thank you. You know brother, I'm not saying I owned it. I'm saying it was owned, and it - on behalf of the kingdom and on behalf of the people, and don't ever mistake my comments to think to even allude (unintelligible) big land owner.

I apologize for that error in understanding somehow, but again we have a lot of pressure going on here. That said, I protest Nai Aupuni speaking of pressure that applies pressure. Political pressure. Illegal pressure to people. Us, the Hawaiian people.

It threatens to exclude those who do not sign up. We saw - I've seen the full page ads in the (OHA) newspapers talking about how, oh, if you don't sign up you will not be included. Exclusivity is not security. Our people deserve to feel safe.

We deserve to feel safe to say what we need to say to state the truth of facts that happened. Nobody can deny that there's a kingdom here. More of the understanding and more of the research is showing beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Hawaiian kingdom still exists.

It is recess or it has been occupied, so therefore there is royalty. Not saying that it's any better or any less than anyone else. We all have our (Kuleana). Please respect that I have mine as well. I respect yours.

Now, we have so many lists, so if you didn't sign up on Nai Aupuni or you didn't sign up for Kana'iolowalu or Kau Inoa, and these lists come out we don't know where.

All of a sudden we know they didn't get more than 35,000 sign-ups, but then they went and pulled the lists from the Hawaiian homes. They pulled the lists from the OHA registries. They had people on the lists who were dead, who weren't even Hawaiian.

You know, and then how do we justify the Nai Aupuni vote when in the face of the Rice v. Cayetano decision that ruled against the OHA elections being exclusive before Hawaiians.

So this is very - it's so confusing not to say we can't understand it. What I'm saying when I say the word "confusing" is that you guys are confused. How America and how Nai Aupuni and all of these set up...

Kristen Sarri: Hi, this is (Kris Sarri) at the Department of the Interior. We're in approximately the last five minutes of this teleconference today. So once again I want to thank everybody for their comments and their suggestions.

Because we are in the last five minutes and we've had a number of repeat callers, at this time we're just going to keep the line open for any new callers that might want to speak in these final five minutes. Thank you.

Coordinator: And to those new callers, if you would like to make comments, please press star 1 and record your name with the spelling.

Kris Sarri: Mahalo. Thank you all for your suggestions and comments today. Your comments are very important to us, and we appreciate you taking your time.

As noted at the beginning of the call, the comment period closes December 30, 2015. The department will consider all comments received by that deadline. Thank you once again, and have a nice day.

Coordinator: That concludes today's conference call. Thank you for participating. You may disconnect at this time.

END